THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

MAY BE LOANED
After MAY 1 1925

VOL. XXXII, No. 2 APRIL, 1925

Swedenborg, the Eye of the Age
EDWIN MARKHAM 129

Have We a Material Idea of Heaven?
WILLIAM L. WORCESTER 149

Emerson and the Science of Correspondences
JAMES E. YOUNG 161

New-Church Education in Physics
WARREN GODDARD 172

The Religion of Science [a review of a book with that title, by Prof. Wm. H. Wood]
LEWIS F. HITE 188

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

Modernism LEWIS F. HITE - - - - - - - - - 214

Loyalty to Truth B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - 223

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

Temptations of Jesus WM. L. WORCESTER - - - - - 233

The Rational WM. H. BEALES - - - - - - - 239

Current Literature :

Shailer Mathews's "Contributions of Science to Religion"
JOHN R. SWANTON - - - - - - - - - 250

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

THE

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXXII.] APRIL, 1925 [No. 2

SWEDENBORG, THE EYE OF THE AGE

BY EDWIN MARKHAM

Author of "The Man with the Hoe," etc.

THERE are two great sources of knowledge—science and seership. The poets, and all masters of intuition, belong to the realm of the seers.

We all know that science sheds light only upon our material world, and never penetrates into the vast realities of the Spiritual World. Only the seers, with the illustrious Swedenborg at their head, have thrown any light upon those vast mysteries. The seers of the Bible shed only a fragmentary illumination, leaving many things in shadow. The world had to wait till Swedenborg came with the vaster illumination, an illumination so great that Elizabeth Barrett Browning says: "The only light that has ever been cast on the other life is in Swedenborg's philosophy."

It is clear to the thoughtful that we are on the path of an eternal progress in all knowledge. Never is truth fully disclosed to the race. Revelation is progressive: the flight of man is endless. Life is a divine adventure, a ceaseless search for God.

So we should always hold the listening attitude. Every messenger has a right to be heard, has a right to have his

claims examined. But what is the test of his truth—the test of *any* man's truth? First, his message must be found to be in harmony with all we know to be truth in the past. Second, it must be found to be a light to the mind and a bread to the heart. And third, it must stand the test of life: it must be workable. I believe that the wisdom of Swedenborg will be found to stand these tests at every point.

Emerson says: "Swedenborg is one of the mastodons of literature, one not to be measured by whole colleges of scholars."

What of this Swedenborg who commands the attention and extraordinary praise of our greatest American thinker —what of this master who extended the borders of all science and philosophy?

This man of astonishing learning was born in 1688, in Stockholm, Sweden, dying in London in 1772. His career can be divided into three equal periods of twenty-eight years each—covering his education, his work as a scientist, his illumination as a seer.

His father was chaplain of the court of Sweden. At the university, the boy Emanuel drank in the classics, wrote Latin verses, took interest in the increasing demand for more modern educational methods. Graduating in 1709, and hungering for more astronomy and mathematics, he went to London, met Halley in Oxford, studied diligently the works of Sir Isaac Newton, explored the arts and crafts of the city.

Returning to Sweden in 1715, he began his second or scientific period by editing a mathematical journal and by publishing an algebra, the first to appear in Sweden. He studied metals, mines, the action of water; discovered how to reckon longitude by the moon. He soon had many inventions (completed or projected) to his credit, including a submarine, an air-pump, a machine gun, a steam engine, a flying machine, a slow-cumbustion stove, a mechanical piano.

He proposed also an astronomical observatory, a scheme for the extensive manufacture of salt, a new method of discovering mineral veins, a scheme for connecting by canal the North Sea and the Baltic. Attracted by his genius, the King (Charles XII) appointed him Assessor of the Royal College of Mines.

Volumes began to drop from his pen—volumes discussing Tin Plate; the Level of the Sea; Docks, Sluices, Salt-Works; the Atomic Theory; Chrystallography; Metallurgy of Iron and Copper; Mathematics; Natural Philosophy; Astronomy and Cosmology; Chemistry; Geology and Mineralogy. In 1734 appeared his "Principia"; also his "Outlines of a Philosophical Argument on the Infinite," which seems to reduce the universe to "an animated mechanism." "The Principia" contains a complete theory of evolution; also a theory of invisibles, which John Tyndall contended for in recent years.

In astronomy, Swedenborg propounded the principle at the heart of many modern theories, notably the nebular hypothesis. He discussed circular, spiral and vortical forms, the nature and phenomena of magnetism, as well as the evolution of the planets from a condensed ring thrown off by the central mass of the primal nebula. He also conceived of light as a form of ethereal motion. The great astronomer Arrhenius claims that Kant, Laplace and others, in some of their outstanding theories, found the basis of their ideas in these writings of Swedenborg.

While in the midst of these multitudinous studies, he took a seven-year travel over the chief countries of Europe, studying mines and manufactories, exploring furnaces, workshops, lecture-rooms, laboratories, museums, galleries, churches, theaters, army garrisons, palaces—absorbing the world with an alert eye and omnivorous intelligence.

In 1740 and later, he published his two great works on the "Animal Kingdom," which might be called "a search for the soul"; although the volumes announce his discoveries regarding the brain and the cerebro-spinal nerve-sys-

tem. They are wonder-books having a compass and insight that place them on a shelf with Aristotle and Bacon.

In all this immense search into the mystery of nature and life, we see what seems a ground-work of preparation for Swedenborg's amazing third life-period, the period of illumination and revelation. For he claims that in 1744 he was called to a new mission by the Lord Jesus Christ.

His mind was illuminated to reveal the inner meanings of the Bible. He also claims to have been given—while yet in the flesh—a certain access to the Unseen, a privilege possessed in a degree by the seers and prophets of all lands and ages. His eyes were "opened" to see into the Spiritual World, the world of which earth is only a shadow—"opened" finally to see, not while in a trance, but while in full possession of all his faculties.

Now the spirit of a man lives unconsciously in the midst of discarnate spirits; and Swedenborg earnestly warns us against communicating with them in the séance, for these spirits on the borderland are usually liars and impersonators. They are the tramps and derelicts of the Spirit World. So to the unprotected there is extreme danger in the touch of the Invisible.

Now bear steadily in mind that Swedenborg is a seer, and has no affiliation with the mediums. The seer belongs to a higher order, and is governed by the strict law of service. Between the two—the medium and the seer—there is a whole polar diameter. The medium, in many cases at least, "develops" or forces herself (or himself) into the Unseen, where she comes into contact with the gross spirits that crowd the earth's frontiers: she gets no light because *they* have no light. The seer, however, does not force himself into the Invisible: he enters it humbly and reverently, and he enters it only when he is called by the Lord to render some great service to mankind. The medium submits to an abnormal "spirit control"; but the seer goes forward in full possession of his normal faculties, knowing that man's place is dominion. No man should submit to the

dictation of spirits; for to submit is to lose his firm hold on personality, his firm hold on freedom and rationality.

The medium enters only into the foggy air of occult nature; while the seer passes on into the light of the angels. The medium never gets beyond the illusions of occult nature: she never enters into the mysteries of the heavens and the hells. But the seer penetrates into those mysteries, for the doors of his advance are opened by the Lord; and he is instructed in the wisdom of the angels in order that he may bring back to men a light for the brain and a comfort for the heart.

But the chief test is in the nature of the revelations that we get from these two explorers. The revelations of the medium are well nigh always a vapid and colorless outpouring of commonplaces—the exegesis of the obvious. I have found no case in which she (or he) gives us a rounded and solid philosophy based upon the self-abnegation and heroic teachings of the Christ. But, turning to Swedenborg, we find a deep and original philosophy based upon a faith in the Christ as the Divine Father of humanity. Here is the radical difference: here is the parting of the ways.

Now Swedenborg claims that he was empowered by the Lord Jesus Christ to communicate with spirits and angels, and was commissioned to report to us needy men a few of the tremendous facts of the next existence. We find some of this report in his "Heaven and Hell," a volume unique in the literature of the world. Thus he was called to reveal new truths for the New Age.

On a certain Easter Sunday in April, 1744, Swedenborg conquered his temptation to go on with his old worldly ambitions, and he turned forthwith to his immense new task.

Now all of Swedenborg's long training in materialism, his long calm investigation in the natural sciences, had widened and steadied his intelligence; so that he could now march courageously on to the accomplishment of his vast

mission, a mission that was unique and massive and never before undertaken in the history of mankind.

He forthwith began the exploration of the World of Souls. He soon discovered that all his vast knowledge of nature and her laws was needed as a basis and scaffolding for making known to men the laws and order of the higher world. He found that the Spiritual World dwells within the material world as a soul dwells within a body. He found that nature is only a shadow of what we may call Arch-Nature. He found that these two worlds have the same fundamental laws; so that one world corresponds to the other, somewhat as a tree corresponds to its shadow.

In all his pages we find no muddy mysticism. We never come upon anything visionary or fanatical. We still find the calm investigator, the seasoned and reasoned thinker, the clear far-seeing philosopher.

A long list of great scholars and writers have been influenced by Swedenborg. They have borne their testimony to his greatness. Among them may be listed Goethe, Heine, Balzac, Strindberg, the Brownings, Patmore, Ruskin, Carlyle, Thoreau, Emerson, Holmes, Henry James, Phillips Brooks, Edward Everett Hale, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. Balzac utters this testimony:

> I have returned to Swedenborg after vast studies of all religions. His books hold the elements of a vast social conception. His theocracy is sublime, and his religion is the only one a superior man can accept. He also enables a man to touch God. He creates a thirst for God. He rescues the majesty of God from the swaddling clothes in which He has been muffled by other faiths.

Swedenborg has been justly called "the eyeball on the front of the eighteenth century, the one man who could see —the wisest man in centuries". And let me say again that Elizabeth Barrett Browning—one of many great witnesses —cries out: "The only light that has ever been cast on the other life is in Swedenborg's philosophy." *

---

* "The Nature of Spirit and of Man as a Spiritual Being," by

Now what was the nature of the darkness that lay so heavily on the eighteenth century, into which Swedenborg came as a giant bearing the torch of illumination?

"Death, doom and destruction" were the three words continually sounding on the lips of the preachers of those early days, and old and young pondered on these portentous themes. Nearly all sermons were subtle and long-drawn-out, running frequently to three hours; while the beadle solemnly turned the hour-glass on the pulpit to show the flight of time.

People looked forward to the sermon; talked about it all the week; took notes of it in church, and wrote commentaries upon it. The sermon took the place of the newspaper and magazine and open forum and club discussion, and all such later activities of the people.

There were some great sermonizers in New England. The fame of Hooker and Shepherd and Mather is still reverberating in memory. It is curious today to examine these pulpiteerings. They show the atmosphere of rebuke and retribution, of tears and terror, that hovered over those earnest, early church-goers.

Frightfulness was the right-arm of the pulpit. Even the saintly Hooker carried the odor of the theological sulphur. It was part of his duty to "fasten the nail of terror" in the hearts of his hearers. He warns sinners that the torments of Hell are literal and material. He cries out:

> Judge the dregs of the Lord's vengeance by some sips of it. If the drops be so heavy, what shall be the whole sea of God's vengeance?

Hooker had an abiding certainty of the total depravity of humanity. He cries:

Chauncey Giles, and "The Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg," by Theophilus Parsons, are useful for the beginners in this philosophy. More recent and scholarly, and also more voluminous, are "The Kingdom of Heaven as Seen by Swedenborg," by John Howard Spalding, and "Reasonable Religion," by E. Brayley Hodgetts.

The spawn of all abomination hath overspread the whole man. No carrion in a ditch smells more loathsomely in the nostrils of man, than doth a natural man's works to the nostrils of the Almighty.

Thomas Shepherd dwelt with painful gusto on the doctrine of foreordination:

If thou be not of the elect, God shall set himself as a consuming fire against thee. I tell thee all the wisdom of God shall then be set against thee to devise torments for thee . . . Never was such power seen in making the world, as in holding a poor creature under this wrath, that holds up the soul with one hand and beats it with the other. Think not this is cruelty: it is justice. What cares God for a vile wretch whom nothing can make good while it lives?

How wilt thou bear the fury of this infinite, endless, consuming fire in body and soul, the fire that through all eternity never goes out? As thy friends are scrambling for thy goods and worms for thy body, so devils shall scramble for thy soul.

Jonathan Edwards, in his celebrated sermon, "Their Feet Shall Slide in Due Time," told his shuddering hearers that there is nothing that keeps wicked men out of Hell at any moment but the mere pleasure of God. He thunders out these words:

The God that holds you over the pit of Hell as one holds a loathsome insect over the fire, abhors you, and he looks upon you as worthy of nothing else but to be cast into the fire!

Infant damnation was one of the favorite themes of these devout divines. Calvin had announced that "infants bring their own damnation with them, although they have not yet brought forth the fruits of their iniquities."

The Calvinistic creed gives the fatalistic theory of foreordination, which arbitrarily saves some and dooms others.

But more terrible than all else was the black belief of that age concerning God and the little children. All thought of the compassionate Father was swept away, and He was seen only as a monster Judge, cold and heartless, his black shadow stretching over the universe. So we hear John Calvin saying at different times:

You deny that it is lawful for God, except for misdeeds, to condemn any human being . . . Put forth your evidence against God, who precipitates into eternal death harmless new-born children torn from their mother's bosom . . . As the eggs of the asp are deservedly crushed, and serpents just born are deservedly killed, though they have not yet poisoned any one with their bite, so infants are justly obnoxious to penalties.

The well-known New England poem, by Michael Wigglesworth, "The Day of Doom," puts this bitter Calvinism into the hoof-beat of meter. This cantering poem was "a best-seller" of Revolutionary days. It went into eight editions at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Many pious people could recite it from memory. An edition of it was brought out as late as 1828. Cotton Mather said that it would continue to instruct children till the Last Day.

With the usual vain-glory of the sectarian, at the very start of his sulphureous epic, Wigglesworth sweeps into perdition all pagan nations with their God-conceptions, however beautiful they may have been. To his dim-seeing eyes, the young god Mercury and all the bright Olympians, were mere forms of the Devil:

Oh, what a deal of blasphemy,
And heathenish impiety,
In Christian poets may be found,
Where heathen gods with praise are crowned.
They make Jehovah to stand by,
Till Juno, Venus, Mercury,
With frowning Mars and thundering Jove,
Rule earth below and heaven above.
But I have learned to pray to none,
Save unto God in Christ alone;
Nor will I laud, no, not in jest,
That which I know God doth detest.
I reckon it a damning evil,
To give God's praises to the Devil.

Lifting the curtain of Judgment, the poet reveals the world at the Last Day, all men heedless in their carnal ease, waiting on the brink of doom:

Still was the night, serene and bright,
When all men sleeping lay:
Calm was the season, and carnal reason
Thought so 'twould last for aye.

But suddenly at midnight bursts the world's doom, and nations are called to judgment.

Look for a moment into this blasphemous poem, written in the name of Him who said, "Suffer little children to come unto me." Behold the children ushered before the Lord, begging to be saved from hell-fire:

Then to the bar
They all drew near
Who died in infancy;
And never had, for good or bad,
Effected personally—
Who from the womb unto the tomb
Were straightway carried,
Who thus began to plead:

"Not we, but he, ate of the tree
Whose fruit was interdicted;
Yet on us all from his sad fall
The punishment's inflicted.
How could we sin that had not been,
Or how is his sin our,
Without consent, which to prevent
We never had the power!

"O great Creator, why was our nature
Depravèd and forlorn?
Why so defiled and made so viled
Whilst we were yet unborn?"

Pretty good logic for infants, albeit rather wiggly poetry. But these probably were Boston infants.

Yet the Lord is not moved by this pleading. He replies with diabolical sophistry, explaining the necessity of original sin:

"Would you have grieved to have received
Through Adam so much good,
As had been given you for evermore
If he at first had stood?

"You may with reason share in his treason
And in the punishment:
Hence you were born in state forlorn,
With natures so depraved:
Death was your due, because that you
Had thus yourselves behaved."

And then he pronounces their doom, with a mercy that no doubt would have seemed magnanimous to Calvin:

"You sinners are, and such a share
As sinners may expect;
Such you shall have, for I do save
None but mine own Elect.

"Yet to compare your sin with their
Who lived a longer time,
I do confess, yours is much less,
Though every sin's a crime.

"A crime it is, therefore in bliss
You may not hope to dwell;
But unto you I shall allow
The easiest room in Hell."

Yet these unreasonable infants were not satisfied and quieted by this proposed compromise:

Then might you hear them rend and tear
The air with their outcries,
The hideous noise of their sad voice
Ascendent to the skies;
And wring their hands, their caitiff hands,
And gnash their teeth for terror.
They cry, they roar, for anguish sore,
And gnaw their tongues for horror,
But get away without delay;
Christ pities not their cry.
Depart to Hell: there you may yell
And roar eternally.

Now when Swedenborg appeared, he hurled the light of Heaven against this planetary darkness.

He made it plain that there is no God who is creating torments for men; for men—here and hereafter—create their own torments by breaking the law of love and justice.

What is Hell? It is the disordered and selfish life, and this has its beginnings on earth. It is this hell that men carry on into the next world, for men are not changed in character by the incident of death. Evil deeds carry their own punishment, whether here or hereafter. We reach the conclusion, therefore, that there are no hells except the hells that men themselves create.

So we have the good news that there is no Hell at all in the old sense of the word. There is no literal hell-fire, for hell-fire is only the burning of evil passion. "The worm that dieth not" is the worm of evil desire that dieth not in the breast of man. All Hells, therefore, are created by men and are freely chosen by them; and they choose Hell because it gives them an open field in which they can freely express their selfish instincts. Hell is the heaven of the self-seekers.

Thus Swedenborg threw the light of reason upon this dark enigma. He also quiets our hearts with the assurance that no children ever go into any hell hereafter, but that all of them pass on to the protection and nurture of wise motherly angels in the Heavens.

Thus Swedenborg rose in the eighteenth century as a liberator from the great fears that were besieging the soul of man. There was the fear of reason: men were told to forsake reason and to trust to a blind faith. There was the fear of an arbitrary deity—a fear that man's spiritual safety did not depend upon the rectitude of his life, but did depend upon the favoritism of God. There was also the fear of a literal hell-fire, a fear that turned God into a monster of cruelty. And finally (as we have seen) there was the fear for the spiritual safety of the little children gone on into another world.

In those dark unhappy years, they were hanging witches in Salem. The churchmen believed in fantasies; while the intellectuals (especially in France) believed in nothing—not even in themselves. There was a spiritual winter on the race.

Into the immense darkness of that century, appeared the courageous seer, the man of light. He was one man against the world. He penetrated the hush of unreason and superstition, and discovered the eternal truth beyond.

Who is the genius? He is the man who can see when other men are stumbling in the darkness around him. Swedenborg could see. He claims that he came bearing a special illumination from the Lord; came because he was called to a great mission for the race. He certainly shed a new light on the Bible, a new light on life, and a new light on death. And under all this revelation we find a profound philosophy of existence.

What are some of his characteristics? We have already seen that he was an untiring student of nature, always intent on getting the facts. He loved truth with a supreme devotion. All this was balanced by his immovable moral integrity. These characteristics are mirrored in his beautiful and luminous face. The face is a mirror of the soul.

And what are some of his teachings? He does not point us to any house of healings where blood makes atonement and opinion saves. He points us to the sympathies and services of the good life. So in defining religion, he says, "All religion has relation to life, and the life of religion is to do good." Here is no abstract metaphysics, but a first-hand grip on reality. The life of Jesus is summed up in the words, "He went about doing good" (Acts x. 38). So our chief business on earth is to become unselfish conscripts of the good. In serving the good we serve the Christ, and there is no other way to serve Him.

In this service of the good (which is also the service of love) we find the clue for man to follow in all the winding labyrinths of existence—in this world, and in all worlds.

In the old idea of God we are told of a Trinity, but are told in such a way that the idea tends to build up in the mind the concept of three Gods. This is a dangerous error. There is in God the same trinity that is in man—a trinity of *person,* not a trinity of *persons.* Swedenborg declares

that God is one, and he gives us also the remarkable statement that God is Absolute Man. Hence God is near to man, is near and knowable.

Now God is at the heart of the vibrating and luminous universe. He is the only reality; and we become real only as God abides in us. All that is not God is only seeming. But God is Spirit; and nature has reality only as God impregnates nature with spirit. Hence there are no material forces: all forces are spiritual forces. God is therefore the only Life: God is the only Substance. If God should withdraw from the universe, all worlds and humanities would vanish as a dream. Only the black void would remain, the Abysmal Nothingness.

Of all beings who have worn the veil of clay, only the Christ knew that he was of the very substance of God. So we hear him saying, "I and the Father are One." No other man born of woman has a right to make this great declaration. But I would say that the Christ is the incarnation of God only because He is the expression of the Reality of Man: He is Divine because He stood upon the high ground of the spirit where He had no interests contrary to the interests of universal humanity.

Highly inspiring are Swedenborg's conceptions of the spirit-man and of the Spiritual World. Let us remember here, that there are two kinds of substance—material substance and spiritual substance. Paul also says that "there are natural bodies and spiritual bodies." We know a little of material substance because we are now living in a material world; but we do not know so much of spiritual substance because we are not yet in a spiritual world. Yet we know that there is a living substance in man, for we know that life can express itself only through substance. That substance is spiritual substance.

We are prepared, then, to believe that man is a spiritual being; that he has two bodies, a spiritual body living and functioning within his physical body. Indeed, man is in reality a spirit-man. *The soul is an organism*, an organism

that is alive within every part of the physical body. The spirit has form and organs; otherwise the spirit would have no power. It is this spirit-man that gives life to the physical man.

Remember that within every physical organ dwells its proper spiritual organ formed of spiritual substance. Hence within this hand there is a spirit hand; within this eye there is a spirit eye. And it is this spirit hand that feels, and it is this spirit eye that sees. So we do not see *with* the physical eye, but see *through* the physical eye; and we do not feel *with* the physical hand, but feel *through* the physical hand. The only thing that can see or feel is the spirit-man.

Thus we are projected upon the remarkable yet reasonable thought that we are now spirit-men and spirit-women. We are all spirits at the present moment; the man who is talking to you is a spirit-man, as much a spirit-man as he will ever be.

What, then, does death do to us? It merely shells off the form of dust, the material body, and leaves the spirit-man standing in his body of spiritual substance, standing complete in all his organic structure as he was on earth before, standing ready for a new adventure of existence in the World of Spirits. This is his resurrection: the material envelope falls off and the spirit-man stands erect.

But where is the Spiritual World that receives this resurrected man? It is not in the sun—not in the center of the earth—in none of the places the old dreamers tried to find a place for it. The Spiritual World is here, it is everywhere, dwelling within the material world as a soul dwells within a physical body. Indeed, the Spiritual World may be called the soul of this world—the living, pulsing, breathing reality within the material globe. Without this Spiritual World the material world would have no life whatever, for matter has no life in itself. It appears to have life only when spiritual substance dwells within it.

Thus every material object is sustained by the spiritual

substance that gives it form. The spiritual stands to the material as cause to effect, as soul to body. Hence there is a likeness, a similarity, a correspondence, between the higher and the lower, between the spiritual and the material. Nature is only an image or mirror of the Spiritual World. Nature is only the time-vesture of the Eternal.

But why don't we see into the spiritual realm? Simply because our spiritual eyes are now covered by material eyes, by eyes that project our spiritual vision into the material world. As soon as this material covering is removed by death, our spiritual eyes will look directly into the Spiritual World; and, of course, we will cease to see into the material world. But Swedenborg claims that his physical eyes were so adjusted that he was able, while yet on earth, to look into the Spiritual World and bring us a knowledge of that world, a knowledge greatly needed to support the courage of the heart on this dim path of life.

What, in brief, does Swedenborg tell us of the Spiritual World, the world that awaits us? He tells us that it is divided into three spacious realms necessary for the evolution of the human spirit—a Heaven country, a Hell country, and an intermediate realm called the Spirit World. These realms are not arbitrary, but each one rises out of the nature and need of man; and all of them (including Hell) are under the wise and loving supervision of the angels.

The Spirit World (recognized by the early Fathers) receives all spirits as they arise out of the brief sleep of death. And when they return to consciousness, they do not find themselves sexless and sterile, for men are still men, and women are still women. Indeed, they carry with them all their old habits, their old appetites, their old hates, their old loves. Each one is still pursuing his heart's desire. Friends draw to old friends. The good draw to the good, the evil draw to the evil—all moving under the pull of spiritual gravitation, under the urge of spiritual affinities.

This World of Spirits is a realm of education, purgation

and separation; for it is the realm where the angels (once men and women of earth) have established hospitals for sick souls, have organized schools for all those "who hunger and thirst after righteousness," all those who are humble and earnest enough to be willing to receive instruction in the principles of the higher life. In this realm, each spirit-man casts off at last all that merely *adheres* to his character, leaving only what *inheres* and is therefore enduring. Thus he becomes ready to depart to the Heaven country or to the Hell country, whichever he chooses, whichever his life has prepared him to long for. The choices of a life-time determine this fateful moment of choice. Choice is the hinge of destiny.

All Heavens and Hells have their beginnings on earth. The sowing of the seed is here: the harvest is hereafter.

"Shall I devote my years to the mere service of myself (regardless of others), or shall I devote my years to an unselfish service of the good wherever I find it? Shall I be a self-lover or a comrade-lover?" This is the searching question that confronts every soul on these paths of fate. This question determines what shall be our ruling love, our heart's secret urge. This question stands at the parting of the ways.

The ruling love is the pivot of the destinies. The love of serving the good swings toward Heaven, and the love of serving the self swings toward Hell.

But what is Heaven? Swedenborg tells us, in substance, that while Heaven exists within man in first principles, it should take outward form in humane institutions. So Heaven exists in the next world as a social fraternity, as a divine brotherhood, a realm where the grasping ego is held suppressed, where each one subordinates his selfish interests to the common welfare. Each one lives for the All, and the All live for each. The old earth-hunger, the hunger for mere private riches, is suppressed at last to make room for the riches of all the people. I fancy that

you will find three words blazoned on the gates of Heaven: "All for All!"

The angels—under the inspiration of the Lord—have done what we men of earth should have done long ago: they have organized for Providence, have created a working-form for Love, a working-form for God.

This is the order of things that should exist on earth, the order for which all the followers of Jesus should work with sleepless devotion. For the Heaven hereafter is only man's belated obedience to the great command of Jesus, "Seek the Kingdom and its justice"—only a belated response to the great prayer, "Thy Kingdom come on Earth".

It is now clear that Heaven is not a realm of idleness, but is a realm where love and justice are in action. It is a realm of beautiful activities, a realm of eternal evolution. In that better country, the arts and crafts and sciences have a free and ever-expanding expression. And the Lord Jesus Christ—who is Scientist and Artist and Lover—is the central light and kindling inspiration of that immortal existence.

And it was this Lord of Heaven who said of old, "I am the Bridegroom." So we can well believe that the life of Heaven is a long drama of love, a romance of the Infinite. Indeed, Heaven is forever in the motion of the two great loves—the bridal love and the brother love. The two living centers of the heavenly ellipse are the Bride and the Brother.

Now God is eternal youth. This is the reason why the earth sinks into winter only to rise into the glory of a new spring: this is the reason why the universe remains forever young. And this is the reason why all souls who touch the vitalizing love-life of God round at last into youth again on the fragrant paths of the new existence. For we have the good news that all upward-looking souls, even the old and decrepit, will grow young again—all who feel this thrilling touch of the youth of God. What an inrush of

the poetry of the heart, what a vision of beauty—this throwing off of the hard husk of time, and this return of earth's weary millions to the lost flower of their years!

So we hear Swedenborg saying in his most ecstatic moment:

> In Heaven the angels are advancing continually to the springtime of their youth, so that the oldest angel appears the youngest . . . To grow old in Heaven is to grow young.

Thus Heaven is not only the true homeland: it is also the true fairyland. It is the recovery of our lost youth, our lost beauty, our lost dreams—the recovery of the lost romance of our existence.

And now, friends, we have had a brief glimpse of Emanuel Swedenborg, one of the intellectual colossi of all ages, one of the half-dozen greatest geniuses who have appeared upon the planet.

In his doctrine of the ruling love, he has set forth the most searching moral code now in the possession of mankind. He had the daring to declare that reason is a foundation-stone of religion. He also drew aside the curtain of the Unseen World, showing that deeds return upon the doer and determine the destiny of the soul. And, finally, he reveals the beautiful fact that each ascending one will find his God-appointed mate on the higher rounds of being—find her and become one with her in the wondrous marriage of eternity.

Early Christianity, a religion that was as lyrical as a lark's song as it came from the poetic lips of Jesus, fell at last into the custody of grim ecclesiastics, and it hardened into a heavy pedestrian theology. Let us hope that the New Truth will not suffer the same fate. Let us hope that interpreters will arise who will set free the exalted poetry that lies latent in the New Teaching. We need to feel the glow of its inner spirit, which is sweet with the sun and fragrant with the April rain.

Some glow of this inner spirit has already gone out over the world lying cold in a spiritual winter. As the genial

Gulf Stream silently warms and invigorates our shores, so, for a hundred years, the warm stream of Swedenborg's mighty mind has been thawing out the cold hard theology of the Middle Ages, making way for a greater faith in Christ, a faith that will be at once tender and heroical.

EDWIN MARKHAM.

West New Brighton, N. Y.

HAVE WE A MATERIAL IDEA OF HEAVEN?

By the Rev. William L. Worcester

MANY persons have been first interested in the New Church by its teachings in regard to death and the spiritual world. The teachings have seemed to them reasonable and Scriptural and satisfying. Other persons have been repelled by these same teachings. The teachings seem to them too definite; they prefer that mystery shall surround the thought of the other world. Some condemn the idea of the spiritual world and heaven presented by Swedenborg as materialistic. It is my hope in asking the question, Have we a material idea of heaven? to help a little to make our thought of heaven true, without involving the subject in philosophical complications.

We are led at once to the heart of our subject by certain sayings of our Lord, in which He contrasts the things of this world, and the things of the spiritual world and heaven, in ways which it is instructive to consider. After speaking the parable of the unjust steward, the Lord said:

> Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness: that when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations. He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?

The things of this world are the least, the things of the heavenly world the much. The things of this world are called the unrighteous mammon, not because they are unrighteous in themselves, but because they are so easily used selfishly and turned to evil. And finally the treasures of this world are called things which are another man's, and treasures of the other world and of spiritual life, things which are our own.

This last characterization, "That which is another man's, and that which is our own," calls attention to a marked difference between conditions of life in this natural world and in the spiritual world. The two worlds, we are taught, are quite similar in appearance—the one perceived by the physical senses, the other by senses of the spirit. In the heavenly world there is sunshine from the heavenly sun; there is the landscape with hills and valleys, and trees and flowers; there are homes with all things without and within for comfort; some things are near and some are distant; events occur in succession as in this world. The two worlds are similar in appearance; but there is this great difference, that things here exist independently of the people, or only indirectly affected by them, while in the spiritual world all outward things are the exact expression of the character of the persons with whom they are associated. The outward objects of heaven are lovely beyond conception, because they express the beautiful lives of the angels, and this with variety according to the varieties of heavenly character. Each angel's home is the perfect expression of his own character and use; his dress and face perfectly reveal the quality of his life. In that world space and time are subject to the same law; those angels are near to each other who are in similar states of life, and those distant from each other who are in unlike states. Time there is measured not by the arbitrary movement of the clock, nor by the rising and setting of the sun, but by successive changes in states of life. In the spiritual world all things will, therefore, be our own in a sense in which they are not here, for there they are the spontaneous expression of our life; they are inseparably and permanently ours.

Our relation to things in this world is different; although even here it is remarkably true that the world is to every one what he makes it. In many ways we are made to realize that we are not really owners of things here. Such hold as we have upon them is but for a short time. "We brought nothing into the world, and it is certain that we

shall take nothing away." Those things which we own, we own only in a qualified and limited way. And what we consider to be our rights we have not always power to defend. Our lands, our homes, our bodies and natural life may all be taken away from us. There is nothing of the natural world which we can say that we absolutely possess. The inner world of our own character and life is all that is really ours. "Fear not them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do." The possessions of the spirit are the only things which no man can take from us.

The treasures of memory are ours, the mental records of beauties of nature and of art that we have seen, the voices and music that we have heard, the words that we have committed to memory, are ours in a more real and lasting sense than the pictures on our walls and the books upon our shelves. Men may rob us of material things, but the mental records they cannot take away.

Yet even treasures of memory and stores of knowledge are not inseparably and permanently ours till we love them and use them, and make them a part of character. Here we reach our real and permanent possession, the love, the character, which is developed by the use that we make of material things and of knowledge. Outward conditions of life may be changed for us by forces which we cannot control; natural possessions may be torn from us, but the faithfulness, the courage, the patience, the kindness and love of God and man—in a word, the character developed in the use that we make of things of this world, this is our own, our lasting possession. Here is the peace of God, which the world cannot give and cannot take away. Here is the joy of the Lord, which not even those who kill the body can take from us. It is the most real thing in life now; it is a lasting possession; it goes with us to the other world, there to be purified, and to expand in the eternity of heaven, and to express itself in all outward conditions of heaven, in harmony with the soul's own life.

By the use that each one makes of the things which are another man's, he gains what is his own and will remain his own forever.

Here is a wonderful providence of the Lord. He loans us at first the things needful for life, that in the faithful use of these we may gain permanent possessions. Every little child begins with material things and with knowledge which are loaned him by his parents and other older friends; how else could he begin his life at all? and it is much the same through all the period of life in this natural world; we are given the use of things that are not ours, while we are choosing, while we are building, while character is developed which is our own.

We may see in several ways the wisdom of this provision of the Lord's love. In this way He is able to give us for our use far better gifts, and a thousand times more abundant, than if He gave only what we could immediately make our own. The things thus loaned to us in such abundance and variety invite and call forth our powers. And even if we are slow in responding, in accepting and using the good things, still they are not immediately withdrawn, but the opportunity is kept for a time before us to make more and better use of the good things offered by the Lord. It is because good things of the world are as it were loaned us by the Lord, because they are given us in trust, that they can be given in such abundance and variety, not limited by the measure of our acceptance, and that, though we hesitate, the opportunity can for a time be kept before us. As we look upon the world with blessings free to all, of sunshine, of beauty and grandeur of sky and earth and sea, and with some share of worldly goods and of knowledge and ability appointed to each one to use, that we may learn to use them and develop the power of loving and of serving and of enjoying which shall be really ours, we should realize that it is of the Lord's great mercy that in this beginning of our life He does not limit His bounty by our acceptance, but loans us freely of His treasure, making us

stewards of His goods far more than we as yet have power to own; by the use of them the power grows. Through faithful stewardship to possession; it is the Lord's wise way; it is the only way. "If ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?"

Reflection upon these words of the Lord has plunged us into the midst of our subject. Several points need consideration, and then perhaps we shall know better whether we have a material idea of heaven.

How often Swedenborg deplores a vague, hazy idea of angels and of heaven! In "Heaven and Hell," for example:

> Those who do not know anything about heaven and who do not wish to have any other idea of it than as of something purely atmospherical, in which the angels fly about as of intellectual minds, without the sense of hearing and seeing, cannot think that they have speech and writing; for they place the existence of everything in what is material, when yet things in heaven exist as really as those in the world; and the angels there have all things which are of use for life and for wisdom. (N. 264.)

> Whenever I have spoken with angels face to face, I have been with them in their dwellings. These dwellings are quite like dwellings on earth, which we call houses, but more beautiful. In them are chambers, parlors, and bedrooms, in great number; they have also courts, and are surrounded with gardens, lawns and shrubberies. Where they live in company together, their houses are contiguous one to another, disposed in the form of a city, with avenues, streets and public squares, quite like cities on earth. I have been allowed to pass through them and to look about on every side, and sometimes to enter the houses. This occurred when my inner sight was opened, in full wakefulness of the body. (Ibid., n. 184.)

> That the garments of angels do not merely appear as garments, but really are garments, is evident from this, that they not only see them, but also feel them; and also that they have many garments, and that they put them on and put them off; and those which are not in use they preserve, and when they have use for them put them on again. That they are clothed with various garments, I have seen a thousand times . . . Their garments are changed according to their changes of state. (Ibid., n. 181.)

Such extracts might be multiplied, insisting upon the

reality of the homes of angels, the objects of use and beauty in their homes, and the groves and gardens which are about them. It is frequently said that the things in the other life are so real that those there hold them to be real, and the things of this world relatively not real.

A long and interesting number in "Apocalypse Explained," after speaking of the earths, mountains, valleys, waters, gardens, forests, vegetables, palaces, houses, garments and animals seen in the spiritual world, in clearer light than things are seen on earth, says:

> They are not material, but substantial, from a spiritual origin; yet they are real things, being from the same origin as all things of the world, with this difference only, that the things which are in the natural world have something additional, superinduced from the sun of the world, from which they become material, fixed, stated, and mensurable; but still I can assert that those things which are in the spiritual world are more real than those which are in the natural world, for the dead something which is added to the spiritual in nature, does not constitute reality, but diminishes it. (N. 1218.)

"They are not material, but substantial," the objects of the spiritual world. That leads us to recall what we have learned about the creation of the universe, spiritual and natural, by the Lord. From the Lord's great love for creating and blessing men, there radiates from Him as the sun of heaven the purest, most living atmosphere of the spiritual world; from this, as it were by a process of condensation, a second lower atmosphere is formed, and a third, and then successive natural atmospheres from the purest and most active, down to the last, even to the inert rocks. All these successive atmospheres are substantial—the spiritual more substantial than the natural, and the Divine the most substantial of all. The difference between the spiritual world and the natural world, is not that the spiritual is less substantial, for it is more substantial; not that it is less real, for it is more real than the natural world. Our idea of heaven is not wrong, it is not material, for being substantial, for being real. The distinction between the two worlds

lies somewhere else than here; if our idea of heaven is material it must be for some other reason than this, that we think of heaven and the objects of heaven as substantial and as real.

We find the difference, the distinction that we seek, in the Lord's characterization of the things of this world as things which are another man's, and the things of the spiritual world as things which are our own. In other words, the objects and all outward conditions of the spiritual world differ from objects and conditions of the natural world in being the exact expression and reflection of the lives of the angels and spirits with whom they are associated. In the same number of Swedenborg from which we quoted the strongest expressions as to the reality of the objects of the spiritual world, we also read:

> All things which exist in the spiritual world are from their origin (from the spiritual sun) spiritual; and all things which exist in the natural world are by virtue of their secondary origin (from the natural sun) material; and material things in themselves are fixed, stated, and mensurable; *fixed,* because they continue, however the states of men may be changed, as earths, mountains and seas; *stated,* because they constantly recur by turns, as seasons, generations and germinations; and *mensurable,* because all things can be defined, as spaces by miles and furlongs, and these by feet and spans, and times by days, weeks, months and years: but in the spiritual world all things are as it were fixed, as it were stated, and as it were mensurable, but still are not such in themselves, for they exist according to the states of the angels, and continue accordingly, so that they make one therewith, whence they are also varied as the states are varied; but this is chiefly the case in the world of spirits, into which every man comes first after death, and not so in heaven and hell: the reason why this takes place in the world of spirits is because every one there undergoes changes of state whereby he is prepared for heaven or for hell. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1218.)

This relation of the outward objects and conditions of the other world to the inward states of the angels is often expressed by Swedenborg by saying that they are appearances, not meaning at all that they are not real, but that they are the inward states appearing, or made manifest in out-

ward objective ways. There are also in the other world appearances which are called unreal, as for example when for the sake of illustration in teaching children an idea is made visible by the teacher, and held before their eyes; or when one having a false idea of himself or of others, sees them according to his idea, until this is dispelled by the shining in of a truer light. But the ordinary surroundings of angels are real appearances; they are realities, more real, as we have seen, than objects of this world, but appearances, because they are the outward appearing or manifesting of angels' states.

We may most truly think of this manifestation of angels' states in the objects about them as due to the responsiveness of spiritual substance to the sphere of the angels' life. The planes or degrees of substance in the spiritual world are not mere projections of the angels' lives; they have an existence independent of the angels. The planes of substance of the spiritual world and of the natural world were created before there were men dwelling upon earth or angels to occupy the planes of heaven. This thought has an interesting illustration in Swedenborg's account of a visit which he was permitted to make to spirits of another earth very unlike ourselves; he speaks of seeing on the way vast regions as yet unoccupied (Earths in the Universe, n. 168), awaiting developments of life not yet realized in human experience. Spiritual substance is not a mere projection of angels' lives, but it is so living that it is perfectly responsive to the sphere of the angels' life, and becomes the perfect reflection and expression of their life. Just here is the essential difference between spiritual substance and material substance; the spiritual substance is so living that it responds perfectly to angels' states, and perfectly expresses and manifests those states; but material substance is so dead that it is not in the same way responsive to our states, but is fixed and stated, and mensurable in itself. This is the essential difference indicated by the Lord when He char-

acterized the objects of this world as another man's, and the objects of the spiritual world as our own.

This difference extends to all things of the spiritual and natural worlds; it is the essential difference between spiritual and material. The faces of angels are the perfect expression of their heavenly characters. The garments and the homes of angels are their intelligence and their affections of use, visible and tangible in their surroundings; the animal life and the plant life about them are the outward revealings of their affections and thoughts. It is one element in the perfection of heaven that even the external things of heaven are so perfectly responsive to the inward life, are in such perfect harmony and accord with the angels' thoughts and feelings; no jar and irritation as here from uncongenial surroundings; no laborious effort as here to shape surroundings to our liking, to bring them into accord with our own affections. It is mentioned as one circumstance which contributes to the wisdom of the angels, that the wonders and beauties of their thoughts are reflected so perfectly and charmingly in the surroundings of their life.

If we grasp this distinction between material and spiritual, between the dead fixity of matter in itself, independent of the states of people, and the living responsiveness of spiritual substance to the states of angels' lives, we have the key to all the differences between conditions there and conditions here; the difference between space and time in that world and in this, which may be a difficult problem for philosophy, is explained by this same simple rule. Time is not measured there by anything outside the angels, but is the sequence of their own changing states. Space is not fixed in itself apart from angels' states. If angels are in states of sympathy and common interest, there are no hard unyielding miles which must be overcome that they may be together. Sympathy and common interest brings them together, and keeps them together if the sympathy is lasting. It is a law which tries to find expression in this world, but laboriously and imperfectly; there it works per-

fectly, and nothing can prevent. Shall we meet in the other world the dear ones whom we love? To love them, to desire to be with them, brings us together. As illustrating space and time in the spiritual world, we may refer again to Swedenborg's visits to spirits of other earths, which were accomplished sometimes by laborious journeys, in one case by a journey which occupied two days*; it means that the people of that earth were unlike us, in a state very different from Swedenborg's own. The journey, he tells us at length and repeatedly, was essentially a change of state; it was a process involving labor and continued labor to come into a state of sympathy with them. (Earths in the Universe, n. 138.) Time and space but illustrate the general law that material things are fixed, and stated, and mensurable in themselves, but that objects and conditions in heaven are outward expressions of the states of life of the angels.

If we have formed at all a true idea of the spiritual world and heaven, it is of some interest to note that this idea can be reached by either of two paths, from the outside or from the inside. We may begin by thinking of the other world as similar to this world in appearance, with all objects of use and beauty as in this world, and then we can learn how entirely objects of that world differ in origin and essence from the objects of this world. This is to approach from the outside. Or we can begin with thought of the Lord of infinite love and wisdom, of the reception of love and wisdom from the Lord as making heaven, and of the coming forth of these as causing the outward surroundings of the angels' lives. This is to approach from the inside. Either approach to the idea of heaven is legitimate, and if either is followed through to the end of the journey we arrive at the

* This natural measure of time is due to the fact that Swedenborg was consciously in both worlds, and reports to us the lapse of time as measured here. The same is true when he tells us that some spirits stay in the world of spirits only a month or a year and others from ten to thirty years (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 866), or when he tells us that the Last Judgment took place in the spiritual world in the year 1757. (Last Judgment, n. 45.)

same idea. It is of interest to note that Swedenborg takes both roads; one road when in the "Arcana Cœlestia" he begins with the description of death, and then of the real world into which one awakens, and gradually makes us acquainted with the nature of that world; and the other when he rewrites and rearranges his material in "Heaven and Hell," and begins with the Lord as the God of heaven, and speaks then of love and wisdom received from Him by the angels and expressed in their relations with one another as being the essence of heaven, and of these clothed by the responsive substance of that world in the outward environment of the angels' lives.

The thought of heaven from outward appearance is first in time for most of us; children first think of heaven in this way, and later learn its essential difference from this world; but the maturer and more perfect thought of heaven is the thought from inward essence to outward aspect. That the outward approach to the true thought of heaven is not wrong, and that it is the right and true approach for children, is beautifully illustrated in a memorable relation in the "Apocalypse Revealed" and repeated in the "True Christian Religion" (n. 623). Certain spirits who had the belief that heaven is only admission from grace, were given leave to ascend to a lower heaven. They soon were seen by a teacher and his pupils, falling like dead horses. The teacher explained that they so appeared because they thought materially and not spiritually about the truths of the Word; and he explained that

> One who thinks of God from person only and not from essence, thinks materially; and every one who thinks of the neighbor from outward form only and not from quality, thinks materially; and everyone who thinks of heaven from place only, and not from the love and wisdom from which heaven is heaven, thinks materially. But the boys said, We have thought of God from person, of the neighbor from form as being a man, and of heaven from place, as being above us; have we, therefore, when reading the Word, then appeared as dead horses? The teacher said, No; you are yet boys, and cannot do otherwise; but I have perceived in you an affection for knowing and understanding; and as this is

spiritual, you have also thought spiritually; for there is some spiritual thought latent within your material thought, and this you do not yet know.

Thought of the outward aspect of heaven may be first in time, but the essence of heaven is first in importance, and must be central in a perfect thought of heaven.

We return to our question, Have we a material thought of heaven? To think of heaven and the objects in heaven as real, more real than objects in this world, does not make our thought of heaven material; it is a part of a true and spiritual idea of heaven. To think of heaven as a place beautiful and blessed in itself, whose happiness we may share by mere admission, or by any other way than by having the essence of heaven in our souls, is to have a material idea of heaven, an idea that is false and dangerous. The whole truth of the matter is told in our Lord's words, "The kingdom of God is within you." "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things (all outward things) shall be added unto you."

William L. Worcester.

EMERSON AND THE SCIENCE OF CORRESPONDENCES

By James E. Young

IF I were to use the expression "science of correspondences" anywhere but before a body of New-Churchmen, I wonder what idea it would convey? It is safe to say that the expression would have no meaning at all, and would convey absolutely nothing. It is a science about which the world in general has absolutely no knowledge. Yet it is of this science that Emerson said, it "contained the meaning and upshot of the frame of things."

Promulgated as it was in Latin about one hundred and seventy-five years ago, first translated into English about one hundred and forty years ago, few know anything about it; and the ordinary deductions based upon it would be thought, at the present day, wild and fanciful.

It is only, however, a small part of the complete science of correspondences that Emerson so characterized. Only the rational, natural part, the part that came to Swedenborg through his study to find the soul. It came to him before his illumination, and was received by him as it had been previously received by others, purely from the natural standpoint.

Emerson was born in 1803, and died in 1882. He was a leader of the cultured literary men who made Boston and New England famous. He started life as a Unitarian preacher, but could not be bound by the creeds of his time. He broke with his church ostensibly through his inability to believe that the Lord's Supper had been intended to be a permanent institution, and declaring that he could not, therefore, conscientiously administer it. He resigned the ministry and became a free lance, a lecturer, and a philoso-

pher. He became very well known throughout the civilized world.

He has been referred to as a prime factor in bringing about the spiritual freedom which the world at present is alleged to be enjoying. He and his coterie of thinkers did much to break down the old creeds, but did little, if anything, to replace them.

He was a very careful, conscientious student, and was particularly interested in the subject of the relation between the world and man, and the spirit and God. He never could arrive at any settled conclusion, and life was always to him a question mark.

He was, throughout his life, particularly interested in Swedenborg, and I have no doubt he read most if not all his works, both scientific and religious, very carefully. He often referred to Swedenborg in his writings and discourses. As we shall see, he was able to follow him to a certain extent, but not far beyond the realm of nature and of the natural plane.

Swedenborg's purpose was to obtain a knowledge of the soul, and to show by natural means its intercourse with the body. He undertook this primarily for the conversion of unbelievers,—as he stated it, for those who compared themselves to brutes, and thought that they would die as brutes, and therefore rushed fearlessly into wickedness. Thus he hoped to help cure to some extent the dreadful atheism that existed in Sweden in his day. With this end in view, until his illumination, he studied eagerly and carefully all the sciences, using all sources of knowledge open to the scholars of his day.

He is universally acknowledged to have been fully equipped for this most important and tremendous undertaking. His genius of the largest calibre and his colossal soul, as characterized by Emerson, made him a scholar from his youth, and his unremitting toil accomplished unprecedented results.

During this period, he gave very little attention to re-

ligious and theological theories, or to the doctrines of the churchmen of his day; and he later stated that he was kept from so doing by the Lord, so as to have his mind open to the reception of the revelations which were later coming to him. He was not a religious man outwardly, and showed no more theological aims or tendencies than most of the scholars of his day; and this was very little.

The relation of the soul to the body and to the world of inanimate things was what he first sought, his idea growing as he worked and learned, trying by means of this to know the soul. Emerson finds that he became a universal savant, a sort of receptacle of all the philosophic and scientific knowledges of his day. He studied carefully all the philosophers, devoting much thought to the teachings of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and other early philosophers. He made himself thoroughly acquainted with the latest discoveries of the body as shown in the works of Harvey, who described the circulation of the blood. He carefully studied the works of the unrivalled dissectors who had found out what the scalpel or microscope could reveal in human or comparative anatomy. He was fully acquainted with Newton's theories and those of Gilbert, who proved the magnetism of the earth. He studied nature under Linnæus; cosmology under Leibniz and Wolff; and examined into the theories and moral teachings of Locke and Grotius. His aim was to verify, unite, and thoroughly digest all these varied teachings. He was one man in generations who was fitted to do this. He did it as no man before or since was able to do it. What he did, however, was to codify and sum up the results of others' investigations and to make deductions therefrom rather than to experiment for himself, although in his early days he did considerable research work.

As to his reason for depending on the research of others rather than to experiment for himself, he said that he had found out that if by his own research he discovered something not yet seen by any other person, he became so puffed

up with the idea of his own ability that he found himself unable to give proper value to the discoveries of other men. He therefore, to keep his mind open, decided to rely upon the discoveries of others.

With his ability and intellect, such investigations must perforce have led, and did lead, to discoveries far in advance of other investigators. Emerson waxes enthusiastic on the subject. He says no one man can pass upon the merits of Swedenborg's work. He wrote works on mines and metals which are still held in esteem by experts. He anticipated much of the science of the nineteenth century; anticipated in astronomy the discovery of the seventh planet, and the present theories in regard to the generation of the earth from the sun. In magnetism and in chemistry he made important discoveries. In anatomy, he first demonstrated the office of the lungs. As we know, the recent publication of his work on the brain was looked forward to eagerly by doctors.

Emerson's enthusiastic praises are indeed well merited.

All these, however, were but by-products, and in a way accidental results of his main search. As he progressed, his subject grew, and he established certain views which were as rounds in the ladder of his ascent.

He named his views the Doctrine of Forms, Doctrine of Series and Degrees, Doctrine of Influx, Doctrine of Correspondences. In his "Economy of the Animal Kingdom," everything is examined into and elaborated on and explained in the minutest detail. He showed himself indeed a universal expert, and was at home in all the sciences and knowledge. Yet he was a man of great modesty and gentleness of bearing, never putting himself forward; never boasting, and never showing any trace of egotism in his writings.

The science of correspondences was at first, as has been said, a product of human observation and reasoning power, like the sciences of mathematics, algebra, and logic. Correspondence has been called the logic of the universe, or of

creation, working on both the physical and spiritual plane. This came to Swedenborg through his natural studies. Others before him had glimpses of the principles involved. He named this science "correspondences" as it showed how the body corresponded or accommodated itself to its physical environment. This was on the plane of nature only. The doctrine explained to him the adaptation of the inner and the outer, i.e., the mind and the body, the communication and transference of affection and motions from one to the other like the relation of the ether waves to the eye, the eye to the sensory fibre, the fibre to the cortical gland, the gland to the sensory; to the imagination; to the intellect; and so to the soul and to God.

By their mutual correspondence, things totally different in design and substance are so adapted that they interact and modify each other without becoming one. They depend upon each other, and act as a united and compact whole, yet remaining wholly distinct from each other.

Swedenborg's doctrine of correspondences before his illumination was worked out carefully and logically and was a complete work and science—a firm foundation on the natural plane for the later spiritual building.

What was later revealed to Swedenborg from Heaven was the knowledge of the specific things that corresponded to each other, i.e., what things in the spiritual are represented by, or correspond to, what things in the natural—the specific applications in both worlds showing how the natural depended on the spiritual and existed only from it.

As the result of Swedenborg's work before his illumination, as the final fruition of it in the domain of nature and as the crown of his work on the natural plane, completed before he stepped across the great gulf that separated the physical from the spiritual, he summed up his earthly researches and knowledges in a statement as to the relation of the things of nature.

In the "Animal Kingdom" he says:

> In our doctrine of Representations and Correspondences, we

shall treat of both these symbolical and typical resemblances, and of the astonishing things which occur, I will not say, in the living body only, but throughout nature, and which correspond so entirely to supreme and spiritual things, that one would swear that the physical world was purely symbolical of the spiritual world; insomuch, that if we choose to express any natural truth in physical and definite vocal terms, and to convert these terms only into the corresponding and spiritual terms, we shall by this means elicit a spiritual truth, in place of the physical truth or precept; although no mortal would have predicted that anything of the kind could possibly arise by bare literal transposition; inasmuch as the one precept, considered separately from the other, appears to have absolutely no relation to it. I intend, hereafter, to communicate a number of examples of such correspondences, together with a vocabulary containing the terms of spiritual things, as well as of the physical things for which they are to be substituted. This symbolism pervades the living body.

This statement is to Emerson the highest point in Swedenborg's teachings. He construed the word "spiritual" in this passage as Swedenborg probably used it—not in its religious, theological sense, but rather in its moral, ethical, or political sense. He says of it:

The fact, thus explicitly stated, is implied in all poetry, in allegory, in fable, in the use of emblems, and in the structure of language. Plato knew of it. Lord Bacon had found that truth and nature differed only as seal and print; and he instanced some physical proportions, with their translation into a moral and political sense. Behmen, and all mystics, imply this law in their dark riddle-writing. The poets, in as far as they are poets, use it; but it is known to them only, as the magnet was known for ages, as a toy. Swedenborg first put the fact into a detached and scientific statement, because it was habitually present to him, and never not seen. The earth has fed its mankind through five or six millenniums, and they had sciences, religions, philosophies; and yet had failed to see the correspondence of meaning between every part and every other part. And, down to this hour, literature has no book in which the symbolism of things is scientifically opened. One would say, that, as soon as men had the first hint that every sensible object—animal, rock, river, air—nay, space and time, subsists not for itself, nor finally to a material end, but as a picture-language, to tell another story of beings and duties, other science would be put by, and a science of such grand presage would absorb all faculties; that each man would ask of all objects,

what they mean. Why hear I the same sense from countless differing voices, and read one never quite expressed fact in endless picture-language? Yet, whether it be that these things will not be intellectually learned, or that many centuries must elaborate and compose so rare and opulent a soul—there is no comet, rock-stratum, fossil, fish, quadruped, spider, or fungus, that, for itself, does not interest more scholars and classifiers than the meaning and upshot of the frame of things.

Swedenborg thus arrived at his natural limits. No sooner had he arrived than the urge of his intellect and the mandate from Heaven forced him to the other and the greater part of the science. Swedenborg's real work was just beginning.

Swedenborg left the natural and went over into the spiritual. Although he used some of the matter of his writings of early life, he rarely if ever quoted them, nor did he after his illumination refer to them. His mind was as completely switched off from the former natural interests and thoughts that had previously absorbed him as though he were a wholly different personality,—which indeed he was.

The real senses for exploitation by the science of correspondences were the senses of the spiritual body. He seemed to forget the natural senses. He devoted himself henceforth to the world of spirits and mankind.

Emerson could not follow him into this field. It seems a pity that he could not. He carefully studied the theological as well as the material writings of Swedenborg, but was not granted by the Divine Providence the ability to enter with Swedenborg into the true sources of life and into the real explanation of this world. Emerson states as follows:

> In Swedenborg's fifty-fourth year, his profound mind admitted the perilous opinion too frequent in religious history, that he was an abnormal person to whom was granted the privilege of conversing with angels and spirits, and this ecstacy connected itself with just this office of explaining the moral import of the sensible world. . . .
>
> Modern psychology offers no similar example of a deranged balance.
>
> Having adopted the belief that certain books of the Old and New Testament were exact allegories or written in the angelical and

ecstatic mode, he employed his remaining years in extracting from the literal the universal sense. This design of exhibiting such correspondences which, if adequately executed, would be the poem of the world in which all history and science would play an essential part was narrowed and defeated by the exclusively theological direction which his inquiries took. His perception of nature is not human and universal, but is mystical and Hebraic. He fastens each natural object to a theological notion . . . His theological bias thus fatally narrowed his interpretation of nature and the dictionary of symbols is yet to be written. But the interpreter whom mankind must still expect will find no predecessor who has approached so near to the true problem.

And this was as far as Emerson could go. He devotes considerable attention and careful thought to the rest of Swedenborg's writings, but a spirit of antagonism takes the place of the former cordial acquiescence. He criticizes the number of the volumes of the theological works, and talks about their immense sandy diffuseness, which he compares to a desert; and the incongruities he says he finds in them, are like the last delirations of those lost in the deserts. He says the vice of Swedenborg's mind is its theological determination. The genius of Swedenborg, the largest of all modern souls in this department of thought, wasted itself upon theology. He says Swedenborg failed by attaching himself to the Christian symbol instead of to the moral sentiment which carries innumerable Christianities, humanities, and divinities in its bosom. At the same time, he admits that the principal powers of Swedenborg's mind remained and continued to maintain a healthy action, and says that to a reader who can make due allowance for the reporter's peculiarities, the results are still instructive, and furnish a more striking testimony to the sublime laws he announced than any that a balanced dullness could afford. He further says of Swedenborg that

His moral insight, his correction of popular errors, his announcement of ethical laws, take him out of comparison with any modern writer, and entitle him to a place vacant for some ages among the law-givers of mankind.

Emerson cites what he calls "Swedenborg's golden say-

ings," which, he says, express with singular beauty the ethical laws; as when Swedenborg uttered that famed sentence, "In Heaven the angels are advancing continually to the supreme time of their youth so that the oldest angel appears the youngest," and "The more angels, the more room," and "The perfection of man is the love of use," and "Man in his perfect form is Heaven," and "What is from Him is Him," and "Ends always ascend as nature descends." Emersons says, referring to Swedenborg:

> He almost justifies his claim to preternatural vision, by strange insights of the structure of the human body and mind. "It is never permitted to any one, in heaven to stand behind another and look at the back of his head; for then the influx which is from the Lord is disturbed." The angels, from the sound of the voice, know a man's love; from the articulation of the sound, his wisdom; and from the sense of the words, his science.

He refers to Swedenborg's work "Conjugial Love" as coming near to being the Hymn of Love which Plato attempted in the "Banquet." He says the book had been grand, if the Hebraism had been omitted, and the law stated as ethics without Gothicism.

Emerson sums up that all in Swedenborg is spoiled by theology; that Swedenborg's books should be read with caution; and although Swedenborg has rendered great service to mankind, he failed to write the promised dictionary of symbols. Emerson's final comment characterizes him as the mourner and the groper in graves.

Turning for a moment to Swedenborg's declaration, which Emerson thought so highly of and with which, according to Emerson, Swedenborg's use on this earth ended, we find several examples given by Swedenborg.

One example, using light, is as follows.

He states the physical truth thus: Light reveals the quality of its object, but the quality of the object appears according to the state of the light, wherefore the object is not always such as it appears.

If, for light, he says, we take intelligence, which shows the truth of a thing, we get this spiritual or moral truth:

Intelligence discovers the truth of a thing, but the truth of a thing appears according to the state of the intelligence, wherefore that is not always true which is supposed to be true.

If, instead of intelligence, wisdom, showing the good of a thing, is called into correspondence, we get another truth: Wisdom manifests the goodness of a thing, but the goodness of a thing appears according to the state of the wisdom, therefore that is not always good which is believed to be good.

He gives other examples, showing similar results.

There can be no harmony flowing from the union of natural entities without a principle of harmony from a union in supreme nature which conjoins single things universally and the universe singularly.

Now, he says, if in place of harmony we put concord, and in place of union, love, and in place of natural entities, human minds, then the following moral truth springs from the proposition: There can be no concord flowing from the love of human minds without a principle of concord in a supreme love which consociates single minds universally, and their universal society singularly.

Or, if in place of harmony we put happiness, and in place of union, love, and souls instead of minds, then the following truth results: There can be no happiness flowing from the mutual love between souls without a principle of love in Heaven, or in God Himself, which unites single souls universally and the universal society of souls singularly.

We find in the "Worship and Love of God," which was written several years later and when he was probably partly illuminated, this example for the natural statement.

The sun is the fountain of all light and heat in his world; nor is it the cause of shade and cold; but shade is the privation of his light, and cold is the privation of his heat. The sun is never deprived of light and heat, but it is terrestrial objects, in that they cannot be penetrated by his light and heat, and also the direction of his rays, that produce this effect; whence darkness and cold.

By substituting the corresponding words, he gives us:

> God is the fountain of all intelligence and love in his Heavens; or is he the cause of unwisdom and enmity; but unwisdom is the privation of His intelligence, and enmity is the privation of His love. God is never deprived of intelligence and love, but it is human minds which do not suffer themselves to be ruled by the light of His intelligence and the rays of His love, and also the determination of His rays, thát is, of truths and goodnesses, that produce this effect; hence all unwisdom and hatred.

It would, indeed, be interesting if some competent man would work out more of these natural statements illustrating the science of correspondences, both on the spiritual and natural planes. Without doubt, a careful student of Swedenborg's doctrines would be able to do this very effectively. Possibly, if the teachings could be put in such a form, minds of men at the present day, handicapped as was the mind of Emerson, might be reached.

Swedenborg, indeed, in his tractate entitled "Hieroglyphic Key to Natural and Spiritual Arcana," a posthumous work, gives a list of several hundred words which might be so interchanged; but they are clearly the product of his early thoughts on the subject, as they relate purely to natural objects, and are not very useful, except as they show the growth of his mind.

James E. Young.

NEW-CHURCH EDUCATION IN PHYSICS

By the Rev. Warren Goddard

THE present widespread interest in education is both significant and encouraging. The ever increasing attendance at our institutions for higher education is indicative of a more or less general demand for larger and more complete views of life and for preparation for more responsible positions in our complex social structure. But in spite of this evident and unprecedented interest in education and the demand for the advantages of higher training at our colleges, universities, and technical schools, we must be struck, if we reflect on current educational theory and practice, with certain serious defects in the modern day educational ideal and method.

Just what some of these defects are, is being indicated, in part, with increasing frequency in the more thoughtful books of the day and in the better class of magazine articles. Examples of such books and articles are "What Ails Our Youth?" by Professor George Coe, of Teacher's College, Columbia University, and an article, "Our Great Private Schools" by John Jay Chapman, in the December, 1924, issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*. The general charges made here are that our schools and colleges are not teaching the youth of the country how to think, and so how to prepare for the demands and experiences of real life. This charge, some may recall, is just the one that the distinguished English philosopher, Bertrand Russell, made recently on one of his visits to America.

But this charge, if true, as it seems to be in far too many instances, is a serious one and really means, when we take it into account with the other defects in our educational theory and practice, a defeat of the very purpose for which higher education exists. It means that narrow,

mechanical and ineffective methods and aims are being pursued and that the meaning of a Christian and liberal education has not been worked out and applied.

If we will but turn back in thought, or better, actually read some of Plato's "Dialogues" or refer to some of the writings of Aristotle, we shall come to realize something of what we have lost out of our modern day educational methods and practices. And this thing that we have lost, is, in general, the concept of a truly liberal education that is broad in its horizon and curriculum, that includes the pursuit of the highest virtues for their own sake, and that insists on free enquiry and the free exercise of critical judgment. And if to this Greek concept of a liberal education we add the New-Churchman's ideal of an angel-man, we begin to see why our modern educational methods and practices are seriously defective and are, therefore, inviting more justly needed but intelligent criticism.

If we turn our attention to the field of the natural sciences and to the kind of instruction that is usually given, we must feel, I think, that much of it commonly found here, is, from the viewpoint of a Christian ideal of a liberal training, exceedingly narrow, and, if not directly encouraging naturalism and materialism, at least, it does nothing to discourage these destructive tendencies. While it is true that legal requirements prohibit the teaching of the principles of the Christian faith or of any other faith in the class-rooms of our public schools, still, we must stop to ask, how many Christian teachers of the natural sciences are there in our schools who would, if they could, develop their subjects in the light of and under the inspiration of the fundamental teachings of the Christian religion? How many Christian teachers are equipped for this task, assuming an interest in it? While the answers to these questions would probably lead to some differences of opinion, it is an *inescapable fact* that our young people at critical periods in their experience and training, in their school classrooms, are not only being denied the right and privi-

lege of a broad and spiritual view of the natural sciences, but, in many cases, anti-Christian and un-Christian motives and feelings connected with scientific data and knowledge are being encouraged and developed, or at least ignored. The teacher of the natural sciences in our public schools, if not from personal choice, must through the very force of statute, pass by in his instruction the highly significant fact, clearly stated by Divine Revelation, that God is the Creator of all the wonders and marvels of *just that very world* that natural science undertakes to investigate and, in part, to explain.

In view, then, of this enforced or deliberately chosen silence in regard to a really liberal and Christian form of instruction in these natural sciences, and in fact, Christian instruction in regard to all other branches of educational training, can we wonder at the prevalence of some of the distressing moral and spiritual features of our times? And if this sort of instruction in these sciences continues, will it not degrade the instruction and the teaching of the sciences, if it has not already done this in some cases, to a low form of utilitarianism and to the position of an instrument of an egotistic hedonism? But if science and the teaching of science comes down to this low level, or if it is already at this point, is there not warning enough, at least for New-Churchmen, in this confession of Darwin's, who, speaking of his attitude toward the Christian faith says, "Disbelief crept over me at a very slow rate, but was at last complete."

The tendency, then, to wall off the physical sciences, as well as other branches of instruction, from other important fields of enquiry and from higher spiritual interests and perceptions, and to produce narrow specialists and technicians, is highly reprehensible, and, moreover, destructive of the Christian ideal of a liberally educated man. But it is just this tendency that has been one of the characteristic features of modern education, and it still continues to be, in spite of the growing recognition of the need of a more "cultural" training for the scientist and

professional engineer. The tendency to keep philosophical and psychological considerations away from the field of physics and chemistry, for example, is well exemplified in a short statement by Professor Bigelow in his comparatively recent book on "Physical and Theoretical Chemistry." Here the Professor is led to say, in speaking of the attempts of the early Greek philosophers to find parallels between human affections and human behavior:

> The speculations of the Greek philosophers and the alchemists are both interesting and amusing, but they furnished nothing of practical value. They drew parallels between the chemical behavior of substances and the human affections,—amity existed between some, enmity between others,—but such imagery serves no useful purpose except to lend a touch of humor. Robert Boyle led the reaction against these *senseless allegories.* [Italics mine.] (P. 69, 1912 ed.)

The above quotation indicates a typical and characteristic attitude in our science class-rooms, as well as showing an unfortunate valuation on the Professor's part of the deeper significance of these early Greek "speculations." But may not a later, more humble, and intelligent age discover in these early "speculations" something of that far reaching intuition and perception that somehow all knowledge is *one,* and that it is the supreme task of philosophy to point out this unity, and for educational leaders to make a practical use of it in the formulation and actual attainment of a truly liberal, Christian education?

But whatever value we may choose now to put upon these early Greek interpretations of nature, New-Church education in Physics, will take into account this universal perception of the unity of all knowledge, and give it its full significance and force in the light of the new spiritual philosophy and psychology of the Church. Or, more specifically, the teacher of the New Physics will organize his course and choose his method of procedure on the background of the new Doctrine of the Divine Humanity, the new teaching in regard to the purposes of the Creator as revealed in the new philosophy of Love, the Doctrines of

Correspondence, Degrees, Influx and Spheres, and, finally, in regard to that all-important generalization, that "universal nature is a theatre representative of the kingdom of the Lord."

With such an impressive and enlightening background as this, the teacher of the New Physics, if he is well qualified, naturally and spiritually, and if he is allowed the proper freedom for development, is in the position to make a new and more intelligent and independent investigation than ever before into the feelings, motives, intuitions and ideals that are involved in both the present methods of teaching Physics and in that method and procedure that will give the teaching of the Physics of the future its maximum of natural and spiritual value to the whole personality of the student, and through him, to the whole community.

If we bring to the field of General Physics the spiritual background indicated above, interesting problems of interpretation begin to appear and at once emphasize the meaning of New-Church education in Physics. Take the part of General Physics called "Mechanics," for example, which deals with bodies in motion and at rest, and with the forces acting upon bodies in these two states. If we look up Swedenborg on the meaning of "force" and "motion" we find that the corresponding terms on the spiritual plane are 'affections of love' (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 8168) for forces, and 'life', or living, for motion (ibid., n. 5605). The motion of bodies, then, would correspond to the changes of state or changes of love which occur as we express our love in conduct or behavior,—in other words, live. The love for practicing medicine, for example, undergoes changes or developments as one pursues his medical education, and these changes if they could be traced fully and their quality known, could be represented by the "force diagrams" of mechanics which show the relation between the motion of a body and the magnitude and direction of the forces acting on the body to produce the observed movement. Making use of the same principle of correspondence it might be

shown that the laws or rules of "Heat" correspond to modes of behavior of love and its derivative affections and to their manner of transference or movement; that "Light" laws correspond to truth on its various levels and to its various forms of manifestation and behavior; that the laws of "Sound" correspond to perceptual experiences and the responses to these experiences in the form of obedience; and finally, that "Electricity and Magnetism" have corresponding facts in "truth of the spiritual degree" and in the fact and effects of "spheres".

Or, to be a little more specific and definite, let us take Newton's law or rule for gravitational attraction, and see the kind of problem that New-Church education in Physics really attempts to interpret in the universal terms of spiritual experience. Stated in symbol form the law or rule is:

$$F = \frac{m \times M \times C}{r \times r}$$

In this formula F is the total attractive force between the two bodies of mass "m" and "M".

R is the distance between the centers of mass of the two bodies. If they are spheres, for example, "r" would be the distance between their centers.

C is a constant depending only upon the kinds of units chosen for measuring the other values. In the English units, "C" would be determined by using "pounds" and "feet"; in the metric system, "C" would be found by using "gram" and "centimeter" units. But whatever the units chosen may be, the value of C once found, is independent of the nature of the material of which "m" and "M" are composed.

Before attempting to give a spiritual or psychological meaning to each term in Newton's formula, and so a meaning for the formula as a whole, let us group the spiritual principles that are involved, numbering the groups for easy reference:

I.

In the spiritual world forces are the affections which are of the loves. (Arcana Coelestia, n. 8168.)

Love produces heat for the reason that love is the very life and living force of all things in the whole world. All endeavors, forces, activities, and movements therein have no other origin than the Divine Love which is the Lord. (Divine Love, XX. 1.)

II.

From this it is that man's spirit, which is the man himself, after its release from the body is actually turned to its own love, . . . there is another center of gravity in the spiritual world, and this with man is determined by the love in which he is, downwards if his love is infernal, upwards if his love is heavenly; and whichever way man's love is determined, in the same way his thoughts and intentions are determined; for these are in the spiritual world, and are impelled by the forces there. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 159[8]. Cf. Arcana Coelestia, n. 6952[6].)

And I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto me. (John XII. 32.)

III.

Weights and measures are mentioned in many passages of the Word; yet in the internal sense they do not signify weights and measures, but weights signify the states of a thing as to good, and measures the states of a thing as to truth. So also do heaviness and extension: heaviness in the natural world corresponds to good in the spiritual world, and extension to truth. The reason is, that in heaven, which is the source of correspondences, there is no heaviness nor extension, because there is not space.

Things appear, indeed, heavy and extended among spirits; but these are appearances arising from the states of good and truth in a higher heaven. (Arcana Coelestia, n. 5658.)

By quantity of both measure and weight is signified correspondence, here correspondence in every way. (Ibid., n. 10297.)

Concerning the measure or degree of good that belongs to a church, it is to be known that goods in the other life vary in quality and quantity, and that they are determined in the case of everyone during his life in the world; they are determined according to the quality and quantity of everyone's faith and charity in life . . . The quantity and quality of the good belonging to every individual and to the church are represented by weights and measures in the Word. (Ibid., n. 8533.)

When anything appears as numbered, it does not signify the limitation of the thing by numbers, but the thing or state itself. (Ibid., n. 2252.)

It has been shown before that the simple numbers retain their signification even when they are multiplied; and that the greater numbers thus have a signification similar to that of the less. (Ibid., n. 2269.)

But the half of a number signifies the same as the whole, for where a like thing is involved, multiplication and division do not vary the thing itself as to what is essential. (Ibid., n. 3239e.)

Half and double in the Word involve the like with the numbers to which they are applied . . . In general, it is to be known that numbers multiplied involve the like with simple numbers, but what is more full; and that numbers divided involve the same, but what is not so full. (Ibid., n. 5291.)

When truths and goods are presented in visible form, as they are in the other life manifestly to the eyes of spirits and angels, then truth is presented in definite quantity, consequently as much or little, according to the quality of the truth . . . But good is presented there in continuous quantity, thus not as much or little. (Ibid., n. 8458.)

But omnipotence is predicated from quantity which is of magnitude, and omniscience from quantity which is of multitude. Omnipotence also is predicated from infinite good, or what is the same from the Divine Love, and thus from the Divine Will; but omniscience from infinite truth, or what is the same, from the Divine Intelligence . . . for to the Lord's Divine omnipotence corresponds good which is of charity; and to his omniscience truth which is of faith. (Ibid., n. 3934.)

With the principles in the above four groups in mind let us proceed to our attempt to give psychological or spiritual meanings to the terms of the gravitational formula and so finally to the formula as a whole.

Take the constant term "C" first. C is the force with which two unit masses attract each other when placed unit distance apart. Its value depends upon what units we choose in measuring the other values of the formula. If, for example, we make use of the metric system of units in determining the values of F, m, M, and r, F being in "dynes" a very small force, m and M in "grams" of mass,

and the distance r in "centimeters," the value of C comes out to be an exceedingly small fraction of a "dyne" or 0.000,000,066,6 dyne. This, value however, does not change if we change the kinds of material of which "m" and "M" are composed. C, like all forces, is always given in a "weight value," just as we say, "A force of 20 'pounds' was pulling on the cart." This value "C" (References III and IV) would seem to correspond to the spiritual standard by which the extent of "correspondence" or "cause" and "effect" relation between two loves is determined, since it determines the "quantity of weight and measure." Such standards would be the teachings or principles of life that we find, for example, in the three heavens. In the lowest or natural heaven the standards for living are the plainer and more literal teachings of the Word, for example, the letter of the Ten Commandments. The next higher heavens would find their principles in those rules which describe the nature of the unselfish love of the neighbor, on a level higher than that of the letter of the Ten Commandments. For example, the spiritual sense of the command "Thou shalt not steal" which requires that we acknowledge sincerely and frankly that all truth of spiritual life comes only from the Lord, would be a part of the standard "C" for this heaven.

The value "F" in the formula would correspond to what may be termed the attractive or conjunctive desire existing between two different loves, say, the love of eating one's breakfast and the love of reading the "Arcana", or love of natural food and love of spiritual food. We speak of "attractive" and "unattractive" personalities and of being "drawn" or "repelled" by such and such persons. It is altogether likely that Newton's law of gravitation will throw some light upon what determines this "drawing" or "attracting" power of personalities.

The terms "m" and "M" are both "masses" but since masses or the quantity of material in bodies must be determined by "weights", and since "weights" in the spiritual

world correspond to the "state of a thing as to good" (Reference III), the weights "m" and "M" as determined by the standard chosen for C would, by principles in Reference IV, correspond to the degree of correspondence that exists between two loves, for example, those given above, the love of eating one's breakfast and the love for reading the "Arcana". If our standard chosen for "C" is made up of the principles of unselfish love of the neighbor as given in the "internal sense" of the Ten Commandments let us try and see what measuring "m" and "M" by this standard would mean in spiritual terms. If we let "m" represent the love of eating one's breakfast and "M" the love of reading the "Arcana", measuring "m" by standard C would be seeing how far our love for eating is a love for a healthy body by which to express better our love for the unselfish life of service. Measuring "M" would be seeing how far our love for reading the "Arcana" is really pursued from an unselfish love for the principles of unselfish living. Applying the same standard C to both "m" and "M" would bring out the degree of correspondence that has been established between "m" and "M" by leading one to reflect on the way one has eaten his breakfast as a preparatory act to reading his "Arcana". The product $m \times M$, which is but an increased magnitude of weight, would perhaps correspond to the increased power or zeal which results when two loves that are in more or less agreement by correspondence unite in act. For example, we enjoy eating our breakfast and we enjoy the processes of making a wise selection of foods and of their amounts, all the more intensely when these things are done from the purpose of making the study of our "Arcana" the more valuable and effective (Reference IV).

The last value, "r". In mechanics this is determined by measuring the distance between the centers of mass of the two masses "m" and "M" and in terms of the standard chosen for C. This value "r", being a measurement of distance and not one of weight, would seem to correspond,

according to the principles in Reference III, to the differences in the principles of action that belong to the two loves chosen for "m" and "M". But differences in principles of life that belong to different loves, in the spiritual world, would appear as distance which corresponds to difference in state. And notice that the value "r" is in the denominator of the fraction and so means that as it increases and so as the product $r \times r$ increases the value of the fraction decreases and so also the final value of F. Applying the standard C to "r" would correspond to the effort to apply the principles of the "internal sense" of the Commandments to the eating of our breakfast and to the reading of the "Arcana" with the intention of determining how completely the actual principles of each act were in agreement with each other.

But putting now our symbols together and taking for the values of "m" and "M" the two loves mentioned above, we can perhaps see how the strength of the attraction between these two loves varies.

First, the total numerator of the fraction—$m \times M \times C$. The attractive or conjunctive force between the love of eating one's breakfast and the love of reading the "Arcana" would vary directly with the extent of the development of the two loves by practice and upon the extent of the "correspondence" between them as determined by the standard C, the "internal spiritual sense" of the Commandments and so upon the zeal with which the two loves had worked together for a common end—the spiritual life.

The denominator, $r \times r$, shows that the attractive force between the love of eating one's breakfast and the love of reading the "Arcana" would decrease rapidly with the *difference* in the principles which each actually adopts as its rule of action when such rules are judged by the standard C. If, for example, we adopted the principle that eating involves no spiritual principles and so ate, as far as we could, what pleased the appetite, but did feel that we should read our "Arcana" for the sake of intelligent spiritual life,

there would result a wide separation in the states of "m" and "M" and so a rapid lessening of the attraction between two such loves. This rapid *decrease* in the attractive force between two loves with the *increase in the difference* of the teachings or principles adopted by the two loves by actual practice or intention, is taken up by Swedenborg in his doctrine of Marriage and in his teaching in regard to the serious effects upon marriage union of wide and fundamental differences in the religious views that are adopted and confirmed as rules of conduct by the two married partners. An example of this would be the marriage of an orthodox Jew and a Protestant where each in heart held to his or her religious convictions.

But how far the above interpretation of Newton's Law of Gravitation in spiritual or psychological terms is a valid one, or how far it has much value, may be a question. But, in any case, the important thing is, that it is just such problems as these that New-Church education in Physics is very much concerned about. Without detracting in the least from the teaching of Physics for the uses of practical, natural life in the world, New-Church education in Physics means adding to this effective practical teaching of Physics just this work of spiritual interpretation of the valid facts and data of physical science. Attempting such interpretations, whether very successful or not, if they are done out of a sincere love for truth and with humble acknowledgment of all limitations, will give a spiritual quality and distinctiveness to the course in Physics that has never before been attained in any other institution of learning, and, in addition, such distinctive work will reveal the universal character of the study of Physics and indicate its vital relation to a liberal, Christian education.

These few observations in regard to the educational field as a whole and especially regarding New-Church education in Physics, brings us naturally to the important question: What will be the effect upon the Church and upon present moral and social tendencies of this sort of teaching of the

natural sciences, and in fact, the teaching from the same viewpoint of all the other branches of a full school curriculum? Or, to put the question in another form, What effect would a thorough-going, active New-Church college or university have on the whole life of the Church, and through the Church what effects could we hope to see accomplished in the way of an effective, spiritual solution of our modern day economic, social, moral, and international problems? How would such a New-Church training help us to solve our problem of our young people, for example? If Mr. Van Dusen is correct in his observations in the January 1925 issue of the *New-Church League Journal,* where he writes under the heading "Youth Movements," we are face to face, whether we choose to be or not, with a grave and important issue. Mr. Van Dusen, from the *League Journal's* brief biographical sketch, not only is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Princeton, but also has been a student at Edinburgh University and at Union Theological Seminary; and, in addition, he has been doing evangelical work among our colleges, and has been keeping in close touch with student's and young people's movements and activities all over the world; and his wide observations lead him to report that the youth of all nations are in more or less open revolt against the "old order (in government, in international relations, in economics, in education, in social organization, in morality, in religion) and against those who have made it." And he further observes:

> *It is a movement toward the new*—facing an unknown future undismayed, seeking no guidance from the lessons of the past as it acknowledges no responsibility for the failures of the past and recognizes no allegiance to the traditions of the past. In every field of human activity and relationship, it feels called to hew out a wholly fresh path, making meagre use of the materials left by pathfinders who have gone before.
>
> It is a movement without a definite goal, without definite principles, without definite leadership—*yet a movement supremely confident of its own destiny.* Youth is on the march, it has no idea where it is going, it has no fixed goal in view, but it is certain that it will reach its destination.

And to these observations, Mr. Van Dusen significantly adds at the close of his short, but effectively written article, the thought, that what these Youth Movements are now seeking, although they did not at first seek them, are the spiritual principles that will guide them in the solution of their personal problems and that will indicate to them the attitude toward God that youth needs.

Here is the picture of youth today, as Mr. Van Dusen now sees it. If it is correct in its main outlines, it must mean for one thing that there are important revolutionary changes going on in the spiritual world and that our young people are reacting, in their various ways, to this new outpouring of spiritual energy and zeal. And this being so, we are led directly to the question: What is to be the attitude of the New Church toward this new manifestation of youthful vigor and determination to be free, and to accomplish? The reply to this question in general terms would be, that the attitude of the New Church must be that of a sympathetic, but intelligent spiritual leader and director. But being such a spiritual leader and counsellor implies just what in the concrete? In our church ministrations it must mean, for one thing, a better and more complete preaching of our Gospel, a preaching of both the letter and the inner sense in such forms that our young people will know in unmistakable terms, that we are with them in every good effort to realize the freest and most complete Christian life, and, furthermore, we must do our pulpit work and pastoral services, so that these young men and women will see with the greatest clearness possible, that our Lord does care what they do to each other in their practical conduct and behavior, that He does care what men plan and think about in their secret councils, that He is concerned over what our politicians do or do not do for the common good of men, that it does make a difference what we think about marriage, taxation, tariff, and a thousand other pressing problems that affect the lives of men. All this the Church must do, without dogmatism, without being partisan, but with plain-

spoken loving kindness, if need be, and with faithfulness to the principles of the New Revelation. This the Church can do and must do better than she has ever done it before if she is to hold and keep her younger members spiritually safe and if she is to do her part in these critical times.

But this is not all. We have not done our full duty as a Church when we have done this. Only when we have established our New-Church colleges and universities where these restless, energetic, play-loving, groping, but also serious minded young people can come and bring their problems and have them sympathetically and intelligently discussed by well trained teachers and in the light of our marvelous and new theology and philosophy,—only then, it seems to me, when there are opportunities of this character provided by the Church for our young people, can the Church have a right to say: "I have done my duty as best I know how to do it."

The Church by virtue of her position and function in our social economy cannot freely and most intelligently enter directly into the details of the problems of our complex modern life. This is not her function and she is not fitted for it. Neither are the Open Forums often connected with our Churches best suited for this important and difficult task. The coming of the Forum is a part of this desire for men to be practical in their religious life and thinking, but, it seems to me, that the results of such meetings must be meagre and relatively ineffective. A New-Church college or university of high quality is the logical place for young men and young women, or for students of any age, to come when desiring systematic, intelligent, and competent discussions of the manifold questions that our modern civilization imposes upon us. Hasty and ill-considered answers to the problems that our young people today are raising will not do; neither will the fragmentary and incomplete instruction of the home suffice to meet the demands of youth that are "on the march." They must have a college or university which has our spiritual philosophy as its background

and inspiration, to which they can in confidence come, and feel that within its walls they may have those free, frank, intelligent discussions of their aims, ideals and questions, that their ardent and forward looking natures demand. And, in addition, they must feel that in their Alma Mater they have not only a wise counsellor and sympathetic listener but also the wisest of guides, leading by the light of her new philosophy into delightfully new fields of scholastic enquiry, and solid, progressive scholarship.

When we stop to reflect upon the wealth of physical data used as symbols in the Word; when we think of the vast accumulations of physical data already at hand outside of the Word; when we think of this and of the vast amount of learning in all fields awaiting the enlightening and transforming touch of the New Revelation; and when again, we realize how little, after all, has been done in the way of interpreting the more or less general principles of Swedenborg's Writings, we must see how imperative the need is for a New-Church institution of higher education where, at least, some of this work of interpretation can be begun in earnest and carried on by well trained men.

Intellectually, we move pretty much over the same ground, year after year, adding little or almost nothing to what should be a growing store of spiritual wisdom. And this seems to me to be likely to continue until we awaken from our lethargy and set the needed machinery in motion for its correction. We know well from our Doctrines what a happy lot of angel men and women they are who have made a spiritual use of the knowledge and learning of earth (Heaven and Hell, n. 489[4]). Should we not, then, by every means at our disposal, and especially, by means of a liberal, Christian education, do the very most we can to increased the numbers of these blessed ones—blessed ones among the living here and among the more living over there?

WARREN GODDARD.

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE*

By the Rev. Lewis F. Hite

MODERN thought and modern life are dominated by scientific prepossessions and by the scientific spirit to an extraordinary degree. There is always something imposing about the appearance and the claims of systematic knowledge. Any extension of the field of knowledge involves more or less readjustment both of ideas and of conduct, and readjustment develops conflict of interests and of ways of living. Some are eager for the change and urge it; others, especially those whose interests are adversely affected, resist it. Between these extremes lie the great body of thoughtful people who weigh the consequences deliberately and make the adjustments cautiously. We are tempted in such cases to use the words "radicals," "progressives," "conservatives," "reactionaries," and other like terms, but when we question the meaning of such terms, we find that they are merely conventional, and serve mainly for controversial purposes.

The modern situation is not peculiar, though for certain reasons it is much exaggerated. We recall that when early Greek philosophy moved westward, following the waves of migration, it appropriated the new conditions—the increase of knowledge, the advance of the common thought, the fresh scientific impulse and acquirements; as a result a distinct cleavage appeared between the body of tradition and the body of philosophic thought. Xenophanes, Pythagoras, the Sophists, and Socrates represented the advanced positions of systematized knowledge and thinking, while the re-

* *The Religion of Science.* By William Hamilton Wood, Professor of Biblical History and Literature, Dartmouth College, N. H. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1922. 8vo., 176 pp. Cloth, $1.50.

sponse of traditional attitudes was shown in the expulsion of the Pythagoreans and the condemnation and death of Socrates.

Another such occasion was the Renaissance and the Revival of Learning. The inevitable and irresistible push of the Greek and Roman classics, after the fall of Constantinople and the dispersion of Greek scholars through western Europe, combined with the fresh impulse of the sudden achievements of mathematical physics, brought vital readjustments and deep-seated resentments. The fate of Bruno and Galileo was typical of the violence of the reaction.

The marvelous technological and experimental achievements of our day have very much strengthened the presuppositions and the methods of advancing science; so that the mind of the age, in spite of many adverse currents, is predominantly materialistic and naturalistic. In fact, naturalism has taken almost complete possession not only of the scientific but of the religious mind, and has arrogated to itself the character and position of the only real and true religion.

Professor Wood has undertaken to set forth this situation, and to characterize its mental attitude and content as "The Religion of Science." His book is a careful analysis and a well sustained discussion of the religious situation, and especially of the presuppositions by which the thought of philosophical scientists is guided. The point of his contention is that many, if not most, scientists have passed over from the field of science proper to that of religious philosophy, and have carried with them the presuppositions of scientific aims and methods, and finally have asserted the claim that the field of science is co-extensive with systematized knowledge. This claim means that systematized knowledge of nature not only covers the whole field of experience, including religious experience, but reveals and constitutes all the principles of religion. In other words, the religion of science is the only real and true religion.

This claim is the most vital issue of modern thought; in

its specific and characteristic form it is the issue between the general body of serious and intelligent religious thought on the one hand and "Higher Criticism" on the other. The issue is just now acute between the "Fundamentalists" and the "Modernists." The Higher Criticism with its naturalistic presuppositions and its natural history methods has destroyed the unique authority of the Bible by putting it on the level with other national literatures. It has capitalized the findings of scientific investigators to discredit many of the literal statements of the Bible and to set aside their religious importance. Galileo upset some of the current notions of the times, and some of the current teachings of the Church; but the science of geology contradicted the main statements of the story of Genesis, and made it virtually impossible for any educated mind to accept the statements as historical and scientific truth. This was the beginning of the scientific overthrow of the Bible as a truthful record. It was followed by a more damaging attack from the quarter of biological history, which was aimed at the very citadel of religion, the idea of the special creation of man. Then followed the general doctrine of evolution, which in principle did away with the idea of creation altogether, and with it the idea of God. In confirmation of this, Professor Leuba's book, "The Belief in God and Immortality," is cited, showing by carefully prepared statistics that more than fifty per cent of college teachers and college students in the higher classes have no faith either in God or in immortality. Doubt and indifference were found in a large number of other cases.

The author tries to mitigate these conclusions by suggesting that many of these people are not "irreligious or non-religious," but that "they feel that they have found a better religious faith than that presented by the ecclesiasticism of the day." They feel an insistent demand for a more vital religion than that found in the creeds and churches, one that satisfies the well rounded educated man. This they seem, or claim, to find in the religion of science,

the religion which the scientific mind of the age has evolved.

The issue which this claim presents is not so much one between religion and science as it is one between certain warring groups of partisans. Much has been said and written about the age-long conflict between science and religion; history has been searched and reported for evidence of this conflict, but what we actually find is partisans and their interpretations. Science can certainly have no quarrel with knowledge nor with experience. and religion is just one type of knowledge and experience. Kantian philosophy was supposed to have made clear once and for all the difference and the separation between reason and faith. This led to a deeper antagonism between science and religion; it also led to the revival of the old doctrine of the "twofold truth," which means that a man in one compartment of his mind could be a consistent scientist, in the other compartment he could be thoroughly religious. The two lives could be led in complete separation from each other. What was true for science might or might not be true for religion, and *vice versa*. This specious adjustment, however, could not last long. The scientist in the exercise of his freedom and rationality strayed into the field of philosophy, and there he met the man of advanced religious thought. Then the conflict was renewed. The world of nature and the world of experience had a different meaning for each, and each called his view the true religion. It is here that the author takes his characteristic position. He contends that the modern difficulty is that the scientist has stepped out of his field and become a theologian, and that this science-theologian has created science-theology, the religion of science. He makes the usual concession that the scientist is within his rights when he pushes his principles and methods to the utmost. As scientist, he may assume that the universe is intelligible on his principles and may proceed to the explanation, but he must leave it to the philosopher and the theologian to criticize his principles from their points of view; and moreover, he must remain quiet about their con-

clusions. Now, if we may offer a suggestion, the trouble with this concession is that the scientist is not an abstraction, but a man, with the usual endowments and interests of a man. There is nothing to prevent him from criticizing his own presuppositions if he is so inclined, and chooses to do so, and these presuppositions will certainly lead him into both philosophy and theology. History, of course, confirms this position. Descartes, Leibniz, Newton, Faraday, Clerk Maxwell, Huxley, Agassiz, and the rest, were philosophers and even theologians.

What we are concerned about, therefore,—to go back to the author's exposition,—is a quarrel among philosophers, rather than a conflict between religion and science. What we have to deal with directly and intimately is *the faith of our age in modern science;* this is the essence of the religion of science. It involves faith in the fundamental principles of science. It means that we must look to science alone for rational guidance, that science leads to the true conception of the universe, and teaches our true place in it. Faith in the universe and in man's capacity to live in it successfully is the only faith that is reasonable and effective. Physical science and biological science are fundamental, and on these must rest the religion of science. The religion of science is religion at its best, it is the religion of progress, the religion of service, and is therefore the real and true Christianity. These claims are a challenge, and they present the issue upon which modern thought must make a decision.

The author next undertakes to set forth clearly and distinctly just what the religion of science is, how it differs from other types of religion, and what are its underlying motives and presuppositions. Here we must avoid the danger of being captivated by phrases. Burke's principle that you cannot frame an indictment broad enough to cover a nation applies in this case. We cannot define the religion of science in such a way as to take in all scientists, nor indeed all those who profess the religion of science. Nevertheless, we may select certain characteristics of religion in general,

and compare them with what seem to be the fundamentals of the scientific creed. We cannot arbitrarily import into the religion of science the meaning which the word religion carries in its own right or in general acceptance. If the religion of science is religion at all, it must have something in common with religion in general; if it is a religion, it must differ in some way from religion in general. What is its specific character? The author here proceeds to give a preliminary sketch, which we shall now reproduce virtually in his own terms. Religion is characterized internally by motive and object; it is an attitude towards the other world of the supernatural, the more-than-human, the attitude of worship and response. Externally, it is characterized by creeds, ritual, and conduct. The religion of science repudiates ritual and institutions.

Now the motive and the attitude of the scientist is the worship of truth, of truth as such. He pursues the truth for the sake of the truth; and his truth is truth about the cosmos, about nature. This is his religion; every man's religion is his attitude towards the universe and the fundamental problems of existence. The scientist may step outside of his proper field, and think of God as the first cause; or he may think of God as immanent in nature. In either case, he may profess belief in God, "but, further than this, God does not logically find a place in this religion."

The religion of science has in external expression a moral code, beliefs, creeds, canons, and dogmas. Its moral code is summed up in the formula, as old at least as the Stoics, "Live according to nature." Moral laws are natural laws, and a study of nature reveals those laws. There are no abstract, absolute, *a priori* standards delivered from above and enjoined by conscience, as ethical principles. Nature when properly studied reveals the fundamental principles of moral guidance. The first article of the creed of the religion of science is that the Book of Nature is the final authority for all thought and belief. Nature is the fundamental reality; it is self-existent, independent, eternal.

From nature by natural processes has come all that is or will be. Knowledge gained by the study of nature is the truth, because she "gives the man whom she has evolved knowledge by direct awareness or immediacy," and "she herself is the Real and the Truth."

From this conception of nature the religion of science derives certain canons which are the presuppositions of all thought about the universe. The canons are these:

1. Matter is mutable but indestructible.
2. The total amount of energy in the universe is constant.
3. The world is a mechanism, a mechanical system whose operations are due to the form of the combination of the parts and their adjustment to each other.
4. All nature is under the reign of law. The bodies and elements of nature have a constant way of behaving, and a succinct description of these fixed modes of behavior is what we call a law.

Under these canons, the universe is conceived as a system of bodies in motion; and therefore the religion of science rests upon a blank materialism. Nevertheless the alien and intrusive factor of motion gives to this conception of the universe further characters which, though inconsistent, are supremely interesting and important, and which furnish the basis for what the author calls the Creeds of this religion, the general articles of belief about the nature of this universe as a working system in its relation to man. The articles of the creed are:

1. I believe in the uniformity of nature. Because of this uniformity universal knowledge and exact science are possible.
2. I believe in the rationality of the universe. All the processes of nature are comprehensible by the human mind.

3. I believe in the objective reality of the physical world, and of time and space. The objects making up the physical world are independent existences; they occupy space and change in time. So that space and time have the same objectivity as the bodies themselves.
4. I believe in Evolution. The present is the product of the past, and in turn is producing the future.
5. I believe in the scientific method, as the only method of attaining the truth.

These items of belief are the ways of stating comprehensively man's response to the system of the universe, and speaking generally they are exhaustive. But there are other ideas which are commonly held to be characteristic of religion; towards these the religion of science has a negative attitude. Properly speaking, the religion of science has no theology, no teaching about God. Religion is itself a product of evolution, specifically the evolution of the emotions, which reaches its highest stage as the love of truth, beauty, and goodness. Against these noble emotions hate, selfishness, and passion contend. The function of religion is to bring mankind relief from this conflict, and give comfort and happiness. The most intelligent types of men find harmony and inner peace in science, and in these cases science becomes religion. The highest type of religion is therefore the rational one. When the spirit of religion aims at a life of service, we have a truer religion than that of emotion,—the religion of science. The term God is a symbol for that which faith finds beyond where science ends; He is not a proper object of scientific investigation. Science therefore finds no God, and has little use for the symbol or the hypothesis.

With the idea of God goes commonly the idea of creation. The doctrine of the eternity of matter excludes the idea of creation. For the religion of science, matter being eternal and self-existent was not created. God certainly

did not create this world out of nothing. The supernaturalistic conception of God and his creative act cannot be accepted. Man came into existence in the course of evolution by natural processes, and not as a special direct creation. Freedom, except within certain narrow limits, is an illusion. Man's conduct, like the universe in general, is mechanically determined. With sufficient knowledge, we could predict every human action now and in the future. Immortality, another idea common in religion, is excluded by the nature of the universe and by the fact of evolution. The bodily elements are immortal in the same sense that matter is eternal, for these elements are the ultimate constituents of all bodies. The race, not the individual man, has immortality, which is natural. Nature only is immortal. The characteristic feature of the universe, apart from its matter, is evolution. Science completes itself in theory; evolution sums up and epitomizes the theory. Science teaches that man—body, mind, and the society of man,—is the product of evolution, "from amœba to man" is the formula. It also teaches that the idea of the supernatural is due to a misunderstanding. Nature is everything that is.

Herewith we have the author's summary. From his point of view and from the common point of view of religion it is an indictment. We have endeavored to present his summary briefly but fairly, for the most part in his own words. We naturally assume no responsibility for the accuracy of the portrayal. In all probability, no one scientist, and no group of scientists, whether the "science-theologians," or others, would accept it as in all respects a fair statement. Nevertheless it does succeed in emphasizing the essential features of a materialistic philosophy, and a thoroughgoing naturalism; and it is this which attracts our interest.

So far we have been dealing with the first two chapters of the book, headed The Issue, and The Religion of Science. We now pass to the author's criticism which he elaborates in the five succeeding chapters, headed respectively: The Canons—Matter, Energy, Mechanism; The

Control of Law; The Sacred Bible of Nature; The Creed—Reason; and The Creed—Evolution. He proceeds with the criticism of the Canons of materialism by noting two required judgments: one with respect to the value of this new religion in itself, apart from the grounds upon which it rests, or the arguments by which it is supported; the other is judgment as to the grounds and arguments. As to the first, a new proposal or system is judged by the impression it makes; the truth should make a favorable impression and a winning appeal, in the long run. This reaction, however, does not settle the case once and for all. If the judgment as to grounds and arguments is unfavorable the system stands condemned; if favorable, critical evaluation is still needed to determine the worth of the system.

As a scientific hypothesis The Law of the Conservation of Matter is admissible; but as a conclusion and a belief it is exposed to criticism. In the first place, the law cannot be a matter of observation or experiment; for the simple reason that the universe cannot be weighed or measured. It has therefore the character of a generalization based upon a limited number of experiments conducted under very precise artificial restrictions. In the cases of combustion and decay, it is assumed that the sensible body changes into the conceptual bodies, the atoms and molecules, without the loss of matter. But this involves the validity of the atomic theory. In other words, we pass from physics to metaphysics, and end not with a scientific but a metaphysical hypothesis. The "science-theologian" forgets all this, and we must judge his belief to be without adequate support.

The same form of criticism may be applied to The Law of the Conservation of Energy. The scientific hypothesis was suggested by and grounded upon Joule's experiments in determining the mechanical equivalent of heat. Under certain presuppositions and assumptions the experiments seemed to give definite results; but they afford no certain ground for making an assertion about the universe, even if we assume the universe to be a closed system. Still less

does the hypothesis enable us to make positive and sure assertions about the existence and character of God, or to exclude God from the universe. The point of this criticism is that while the hypothesis may be legitimate for scientific purposes, it cannot be made an article of metaphysical belief, nor can the law be taken as a metaphysical reality.

The third characteristic of the religion of science is the idea of a mechanical universe. The point of the criticism is that the analogy of the machine is not carried far enough, for any concrete machine has a maker and its operation is controlled by the purpose of the maker. A self-existent and self-operating machine, therefore, would lack the proper and full nature of a machine, viz., the purpose and control of the maker, the Creator. But dropping the analogy, there is no evidence that the universe is through and through mechanical. There is of course abundant uniformity, but uniformity is characteristic of any successful or systematic expression of a purpose. Here again it may be said that the mechanical theory of the universe is within certain limits serviceable for scientific purposes, but when pushed to a metaphysical status it becomes self-contradictory. In short, it cannot be said with scientific propriety that matter is self-existent and eternal, that the law of the conservation of energy holds universally, or that nature is all that is, and is a mechanical system. These are metaphysical assertions about the nature of the universe which cannot be verified by scientific data and principles.

The religion of science is an acknowledgment of the supremacy of the universe, and an acceptance of the requirement that we live in accordance with its demands; and further it is an acknowledgment of nature as the sum total of the things of the universe. Nature, so it is held, is the law of life for man and for all creatures. This is expressed by the well-known phrase "The Reign of Law," which means to assert not merely the uniformity of nature but the binding and effective character of that uniformity. We need not pause to criticize the use of the phrase when

meaning the hypostatized abstraction which operates *ab extra* in and through nature upon all the things of nature. Such a law would be a gratuitous metaphysical entity, with no conceivable efficacy. Nor need we trouble ourselves with the meaning of law as a succinct description, however accurate. But law as uniformity, as uniform mode of behavior, is on a different footing. In this sense there is without doubt a reign of law in nature. The question is whether we are to think of this law as mechanical or as teleological. There is abundant evidence that we do bend the laws of nature to our purposes, but this is only another way of saying that we yield to them and obey them. Whether the laws of nature are in themselves teleological or not is a question of primary importance for the interpretation of the cosmos; but we are here concerned with the view that the laws of nature operate with mechanical necessity. Water, for example, flows down hill or up hill by mechanical necessity, and so for numberless other cases. The religion of science accepts and insists upon this view, and makes it a characteristic feature of the mechanical universe. The criticism comes from the direction of animal behavior with its spontaneity and efficiency. The behavior of animals, and especially of man, exhibits various types and degrees of uniformity, but it would require a long forced march of theory to bring this behavior under mechanical necessity. Nothing less than a thorough-going materialistic philosophy could accomplish the feat. The materialistic alternative is not only rendered questionable, but is obviated, by the fact that uniformity is consistent with the expression of purpose and is demanded by it. The conclusion is that however we take the meaning of "The Reign of Law," the materialistic and mechanistic interpretation is uncalled for and indefensible.

Religions usually have sacred books which are looked to as authoritative sources of religious truth; the religion of science claims the Book of Nature as its authoritative source of truth. The Book of Nature is open to all who will read

and the truth of Nature can be learned by all who will seek it with "open and properly prepared mind." Nature is known directly, immediately, and concretely; all that is known is known about Nature, and all the truth we possess or can acquire is truth about Nature. In these assertions, in these articles of faith, the religion of science goes beyond the province of science into the field of philosophy, and the philosophy which it embraces is Naturalism. The claim that Nature is the authoritative source of all truth, raises and forces the issue between Naturalism and Supernaturalism. The issue is most sharply defined by the opposition between the naturalistic and the supernatural view of the Bible. According to the naturalistic view, the Bible is a natural product of human thought and experience; its meaning is fully ascertained when its natural history is known. In other words, the Bible is a national literature; and when we know the history of the race, of the men who wrote it, of the times when the writing was done, we know all that can be known about it. All we have to do is to get back into the position of the writers, and read what they put into it. This is the natural history method, and (so the claim is) it is the only proper method of studying anything, the Bible not excepted; it is exhaustive and complete. The supernatural view looks to revelation as the distinguishing characteristic of the Bible, and seeks to explain its history and its influence by the fact that it was inspired, not by Nature but of God. It is both true and important that the Bible as a matter of course has a natural history, and as an integral part of its character this history should be thoroughly well known; but a part of this history is the fact that men, the most advanced men of their times, have for thousands of years believed the Bible to be the Word of God; and this belief has been supported by the history of the influence and power it has exerted upon mankind. This part of the history cannot be ignored on the ground that it lies outside of science and the scientific method; it is history which is rooted in experience, the source and the au-

thority for all science. The claim, therefore, that the Book of Nature is the only authoritative source of truth and religion has to be rejected for the reason that it ignores the larger body of human experience and is inconsistent with the actual content of systematized knowledge.

There is a curious and disastrous inconsistency in the author's criticism of the claim that the religion of science is religion rationalized, whereas other religions are emotional products. He points out, and rightly, that religion everywhere and at all times has as its distinctive characteristic some form of belief. The growth of religion is the growth of knowledge, knowledge of God and of human destiny. Religion is primarily revelation, and revelation is discovery; "Men by searching find out God." New emotions came with new knowledge. Religion is both rational and emotional. In contrasting reason and emotion, the religion of science becomes rationalism, and its method of interpretation is rationalistic. There is a shade of inconsistency between this conclusion and the author's former position that the religion of science is naturalistic. To say that nature is the final authority for all thought and belief, and the source of all knowledge and truth, and then to say "I believe in reason as the sole source of true knowledge," raises a sharp issue between naturalism and rationalism. It is a questionable reconciliation to say that for the religion of science reason is identical with the orderliness of the universe. We may of course say that it is the orderliness of the universe that makes it comprehensible to reason, so far as it is comprehensible; this is quite another thing.

But passing over this rather subtle point, we come to a much more serious, or at least a more flagrant inconsistency, in the author's criticism of the rationalistic method of dealing with the Bible. This is a crucial point because of the position of the Bible in the Christian religion. After stating and contrasting the various methods of Bible interpretation, viz., the literal, the "prooftext," the allegorical, the scientific, better known as "Higher Criticism," he de-

fines the rationalistic as that which assumes to declare the final truth, identifies causal coherence with reason, declares miracles impossible since science discovers none such, and that God did not create the world since matter is eternal. These he says are conclusions of materialistic rationalism, —a metaphysical theory, not the teachings of science proper. It is the case of scientist turning theologian, and abandoning the scientific method to adopt the dogmatic. It is modern scholarship that has adopted the truly scientific method of Bible interpretation. He then goes on to sketch the natural history method, in the usual way, and makes the contrast by applying both methods to the Bible "stories of creation," the "story of the Virgin Birth," and the "resurrection of Jesus." The religion of science with its rationalistic method dismisses these as irrational fictions. But the scientific method penetrates the history of these stories and gets their essential significance. The outcome of the stories of creation is a philosophy of the universe based upon the primacy of personality, and God is given the place of primacy. The stories themselves are a rehash of Babylonian tradition. The significance of the story of the Virgin Birth is that this story is one of the "ways in which the men of that time tried to give expression to their faith in the superior character of Jesus of Nazareth." The "historical attestation" of this basal belief is the point of the story, the story itself is "dirty water." As to the Resurrection, men first knew Jesus and then could believe in his resurrection. It was the impression of his personality that made the resurrection faith possible. It was faith in the divine character of Jesus that made the resurrection story believable, not the fact of the resurrection that established the belief. The story was merely a "historical attestation" of the impression of his Personality. The essential fact was that the impression of the personality of Jesus carried men's faith through death to the immortal existence. In accepting this method and its results in these cases, the author does not seem to be aware of the complete

surrender he has made to naturalistic rationalism, and that he abandons the whole ground of his contention against the religion of science.

The next three chapters deal with the Creed and the Teachings of Evolution. The treatment is a critical summary of the consequences rather than the presuppositions of evolutionistic philosophy. The Religion of Science incorporates the Teachings of Evolution. The criticism is directed against the teaching as to the evolution of religion. The word evolution is used to mean either the actual process of the universe, or the body of doctrine about the process. As process evolution is supposed to be exemplified in the transition, or progress, from star dust to solar systems, and from protoplasm to man. Biological history supplemented by geology is understood to be the history of a continuous development of life from stage to stage, and from form to form, each succeeding stage and form growing directly out of the preceding. Putting together these two aspects of the doctrine, the cosmological and the biological, we bring the history of the physical world and the history of life under the evolutionary formula, and the transition from matter to life, from material bodies to living bodies, is made continuous. Here we have a universal scheme, and the universe which it marks out is what we call Nature. Nature then is the whole universe; all existent things have place in it; whatever takes place in it is natural. In other words, everything and every event has a natural explanation. All this is not science, it is philosophy; and the philosophy is naturalism. The attempt to develop this philosophy systematically and completely meets certain characteristic difficulties. The first difficulty appears when we face the transition from matter to life, from simple material bodies to living bodies. This is an obscure situation both for science and philosophy, but the hypothesis of a continuous process breaks down before the fact that life appears not merely as a new character, but as a foreign character. Whatever the fact may be, the transition from

mud to protoplasm is inconceivable. Then in the development of life, we come, not to mention the origin of species, to another sudden break when consciousness and mental life appear. However obscure the line of demarcation between plants and animals, consciousness is inconceivable as brain state, or as any bodily state. Body, life, and consciousness are three discrete entities, three discrete degrees or levels of existence. We cannot pass from one to the other by a continuous process either in fact or in thought. In view of these obvious and recognized impossibilities, evolution is nothing but a postulate which can only mean that if our knowledge of the biological series was complete, we could observe a continuous process running throughout the entire length of the series from beginning to end. If a man chooses to make the idea of evolution the goal of his science, no one can object, except on the ground of narrowness and blindness; but certainly the biologist is not in the position to assert that the goal is reached.

This situation, which we here sketch in our own words, the author views as intolerable. Passing over the naturalistic presuppositions as already dealt with, he directs attention to some fatal objections. First, being materialistic and naturalistic, it rules out God; it also rules out purpose. As a continuous mechanical process evolution has no end, although, curiously enough, for man, if not for other animals, and even plants, it has reached its climax in the individual; but the evolution of society is still going on endlessly. Man himself is the product of evolution, and his existence ceases with the dissolution of the body. Religion is also a product of evolution, and so is the idea of God, although God Himself does not really exist. The idea of God together with religion is supposed to have evolved out of man's emotion, and to have acquired intellectual characters in the course of the evolution. This places the origin and nature of religion solely in man. This is another way of saying that religion of supernatural origin and evolution are incompatible, for the simple reason that there is no such thing as the super-

natural. Evolution, in short, being a natural process, rules out in principle and in fact the supernatural; it limits all knowledge and experience to nature, and finds in nature the explanation of all history and all fact.

In spite of the many pertinent and trenchant criticisms of evolutionism, it is a significant illustration of the overwhelming dominance of naturalism in professional as well as in the popular thought of the day, that the author concludes with a statement that re-admits evolution into his scheme of thought and of the world. He says: "There is then a qualitative evolution leading up to the time when men shall see Him and be like Him." Strip this of the conventional formula, and we have a statement that any evolutionist would naturally adopt. In the same vein he adds, "Civilization is likewise qualitative evolution toward a definite end"; and further, "The evolution proceeds not in a straight line but through cycles with the constantly upward trend." This is the familiar figure of the spiral, and we need not be too much impressed by it. The question is, in the case of the evolution is the spiral upward or downward.

The author closes with a chapter on The Real Christianity, followed by some general remarks in the way of a final summing up. He clears the field by first asking, can the religion of science be identified with real Christianity? He answers, "No"; on the ground that what claims to be a religion, and at the same time leaves out God, the spiritual man, and immortality, is no religion at all, still less is it Christianity. Again, the religion of science professes that social service is the essence of Christianity, and that therefore it is the real Christianity. In answer to this contention it is objected that social service is involved in Christian life because God's love for individual men finds proper expression in social service; but it is the love of God that is the essence of Christianity. What then is real Christianity? he asks. In approaching the question, he surveys and enumerates the various ideas of Christianity that are en-

tertained. The two antithetic views of Christianity are, that it is "an absolute, *ab extra,* original and complete, divine insert into history, an absolutely God-given revelation with no human conditioning," on the one hand; on the other is the view that Christianity is "the product of the human spirit." Between these, and more or less shaded, are the views: that Christianity "is a revelation supernaturally revealed but humanly conditioned"; that it is "the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles"; that it is "essentially a life"; that it is "a collective experience"; that it is "a set of dogmas and intellectual beliefs which are the result of the conflict between the philosophical and the religious ideas of the day"; that it is "a phase of historical religious development".

In criticism of these views, stress is laid on human conditions and historical development. The conclusion is that Christianity is the religion of Christ. The impression of his personality resulted in many attempts to formulate this impression, but the essence of Christianity is Christ's knowledge of God, expressed in the formula, love to God and the neighbor. In this view, there are no teachings of Christ properly speaking; the four Gospels are four different ways in which "the men who knew him tried to give intellectual expression to their belief in his divine character". Here again the author lapses back into naturalism, and into a position substantially identical with that of the religion of science. The book as a whole, in spite of its critical undertaking, and in spite of considerable success, is a signal illustration of the helplessness of modernism in the effort to free itself from the toils of naturalistic rationalism.

However, it is not so much the fate of this book, as it is the fate of Christianity that concerns us. If naturalism is to prevail, not only Christianity but religion is doomed. The religion of science is only a transition stage from our religious inheritance and our religious prepossessions to out and out rejection of all religion.

Without undertaking to deal with the whole modernistic

situation, or to resume the argument of the book, we may properly give some further consideration to what is designated the religion of science. Whether or not there is properly speaking any such thing as the religion of science, it is unquestionably true that the religious situation of today is extraordinarily complicated and painfully unsettled. The complication is due primarily to the astounding recent advances of the natural sciences and their mechanical applications. The ordinary life of men is so preoccupied with machines, mechanics, and the products of scientific theory and method, that they have acquired a characteristic type of mentality as well as behavior. This type of mentality is observable in every department of life, in all classes and groups, in all occupations. We are passing from the age of steam to the age of electricity, from railways and trolleys to automobiles and flying machines, from telegraph to telephone and the wireless. We are in the age of fast living; like many automobile drivers we are living thoughtlessly and recklessly, with minds bent on the working of the machine. We live in an age of ceaseless and exhaustless outpourings of the printing press. Words, ideas, mental images, sentiments, attitudes, pass from mind to mind in an endless stream and in endless multiplicity. We have the city habit of taking things in at a glance, and this habit extends to our mental operations; we are too much on the go either to think or to digest. We live in a world of gossip, social, literary, political, religious; we are victims of propaganda from countless sources and through unequaled agencies.

These conditions have impressed a new character upon the life of men, upon the life of the body and upon the life of the spirit. The multitudinous demands upon the attention, the strenuous efforts to meet the requirements of business, the uncertainty and difficulty of making a living, impose constant strain and high nervous tension. The result is uneasiness, restlessness, discontent, and a disposition to seek relief in new situations and in new enterprises;

and so we have the craze for novelty, high-colored expectations, and eager impulse to rush into new programs with vivid pictures of success, all characteristic symptoms of modernized life.

On the other hand, the amazing success of large business operations, of mechanical invention, and scientific experimentation, and of scientific theory, have begotten a highly assured confidence in man's abilities and in scientific method. The field of knowledge has been so immensely extended and so minutely subdivided that no one man can do more than get a general impression of it. The day has long gone by when a man like Aristotle or Leibniz or Swedenborg could acquire the knowledge and master the science of his time. The average man must be content with summary reports from the various departments and branches. These give an impressive, though vague, picture of the whole. This whole is summed up in the word, Science. So conceived, Science comes to be an hypostatized abstraction, a general idea transformed into a substantial entity; in the mediæval sense, a realistic universal. As such, Science is the supreme standard of real knowledge, it is final authority as to truth and reality. The appeal to Science is overwhelming; what Science declares, must be accepted under the pain of excommunication from the ranks of the educated and the competent. The stamp of being scientific is a universal passport to all theory, opinion, arguments, and conclusions. In short, Science is the supreme arbiter of human thought and destiny. A life according to the teachings of Science is the only safe and sane life, and this life alone realizes the full purpose of man's existence. This conception of Science and this attitude towards Science involves such feelings as admiration, awe, reverence, loyalty, adoration,—feelings which we ordinarily ascribe to the content of religion. To this extent and in this sense, there is a Religion of Science.

But Science in addition to being this hypostatized and glorified abstraction, is also identified both in thought and

in language with Nature. Geology is the book of Nature, as recorded in the history of the rocks; biology is the book of Nature, as recorded in the history of plants and animals. So the history of the universe is the entire book of nature, and natural history is the whole truth about the universe.

Nature again, in another aspect and in another character, is the reality, and the whole of the reality, about which knowledge is concerned. Nature in this sense is external to Science, beyond Science; it is that to which Science approximates, and which gives truth to Science; that out of which all Science and all knowledge "evolve". In this sense, Nature is just the universe, and the whole universe. Nature, in fact, is all there is; what we call the spiritual and what we call the divine, if they exist at all, must exist in Nature and be of Nature. Accordingly, Nature is not only the object of all real knowledge, but of all properly grounded attitudes, feelings, sentiments, etc., such as are usually brought under the head of religious. In short, Nature is the only proper object of worship, if worship is allowed any place in real life. This worship of Nature is a deeper and more dangerous form of the religion of science than is the worship of Science itself. It is more deeply rooted in the natural interests and habits of men, and therefore rests on the primary motives and presuppositions of naturalism more firmly than does the worship of Science, which is characteristically arbitrary and conventional; it is a fictitious naturalism, a philosophy which is based upon scientific theories and presuppositions. Whereas the worship of Nature has a more objective character and is more directly grounded upon religious speculation. The history of the doctrine of "Natural Religion" shows how easy it is to pass speciously from the idea of Nature to the idea of God, whether through pantheism, or through some other less definite way. But in either case, the religion of Science rests upon certain fundamental presuppositions which are characteristic of all forms of naturalistic philosophy.

Ever since the Early Greek Philosophers completed their interpretations of Nature in the conception of the Atomic Theory, the notion of ultimate, changeless, solid, self-existent particles of matter has held sway in scientific and in common thought. This notion is the scientific and philosophic basis of all materialism, and it is the starting point of naturalism, for it makes a sharp distinction between matter and mind. Ever since the days of Plato it has been the effort of philosophy to overcome this distinction. In modern times, although the old Greek form of the atomic theory has been challenged and threatened by recent speculation, the fundamental conception of body as Parmenides formulated it has survived in spite of various metaphysical attacks. Bodies are invested with two properties, permanence and motion, which though in the last analysis inconsistent and unintelligible, give us the basis of our philosophy of Nature—bodies, the basis of change, and motion, the basis of our notions of force, energy, and cause. Herewith we have the foundations of naturalism. All Nature is explicable in terms of matter, change, motion, force, energy, and cause. The presuppositions of this scheme of explanation are: the permanence and self-existence of matter; the total amount of energy in the universe is constant, another way of saying that no motion, force, or cause, enters the system of Nature from without; bodies behave in uniform ways, and this uniformity holds throughout Nature; every stage of Nature evolves out of the preceding and develops into the succeeding,—the law of cause and effect, or the doctrine of evolution. It is obvious that all these presuppositions grow out of the conception of bodies and their behavior; it is therefore a materialistic philosophy of Nature. But the transition from materialism to naturalism is both easy and inevitable.

The fact of uniformity in Nature is so obvious, so striking, and so important, that it has acquired the character of universal law. In the succession of events uniformity becomes for our thought the necessary and inviolable law of

cause and effect; while the fact of gradual change, progress, growth and development, so interesting and so characteristic of all the processes of Nature, has been generalized and universalized into the law of evolution. These two conceptions,—the uniformity of Nature and the law of evolution,—while resting on the basis of materialism, are the specific presuppositions of naturalism. As scientific ideals of possible attainment, these conceptions are stimulating and, within certain limits, legitimate; but as metaphysical presuppositions and as ultimate principles of the interpretation of Nature, they are not only highly questionable but they are positively vicious. The abundance of practical and approximate uniformities in Nature should not blind us to the fact that we have no examples of absolute uniformities and no indirect evidence of them. The two typical cases of Nature's uniformities,—the earth's daily rotation around its axis and its yearly revolution around the sun,—are signal instances of approximation, or of statistical average. Or, to take other cases, there is strictly speaking no body in the universe which obeys the law of gravitation, for the simple reason that every body moves subject to countless disturbing influences; so, too, we are safe in saying that there is no actual case of uniform motion. These laws are abstractions, and are meant to apply to ideal, not actual, situations. When we take them as philosophical principles and metaphysical realities, we go far beyond their proper character and meaning, and give them a place in our interpretation of the universe which they do not rightfully occupy. When we go further and make them the ground of excluding from the universe spiritual and Divine realities, they become positively destructive of the highest and best in human experience.

Some of these considerations, however, are more or less remote from the ordinary states of mind which constitute the religion of science. It is not so much the permanence of matter, the conservation of energy, and the uniformity of Nature, as it is the law of cause and effect and the law

of evolution that drive our thought into naturalism and make Nature a virtual object of worship. In our practical life we observe and must obey the law of cause and effect on the pain of death or failure; in our intellectual life we find peculiar satisfaction in the law of evolution, because of its apparent simplicity and universality. Under the law of evolution we seem to bring the universe into order and give it the character of progress. We may think of evolution as the mode in which the law of cause and effect acts to constitute the successive stages, states, and terms of the universe. We place the beginning arbitrarily in matter, but no end is assigned. The process is all inclusive as well as endless. Matter, life, and consciousness are successive stages of the process. Rocks, plants, and animals are the series of bodies. The system breaks down when we undertake to complete it in detail by arranging the *individuals* in order. Our natural history classifications are more or less abstract and arbitrary in the face of the immense variety and endless complications. These so-called laws, then, are scientific and philosophical postulates rather than concrete fact and metaphysical reality.

We conclude that the religion of science rests upon fictitious prepossessions. Its essence is naturalism. When it professes belief in God and spiritual life, it is pantheistic and naturalistic, or it imports *ab extra* foreign and inconsistent elements into its body of principles and beliefs. Like all materialism and naturalism, it strengthens itself by making an illegitimate and inconsistent use of traditional and conventional theology and psychology. The idea of God is the essential and indispensable factor in religion, and the existence of God is necessary to any genuine religious experience. Real Christianity is the worship of the Lord Jesus Christ as God, not only as God in the Flesh, but as the Glorified Man, the one only God of heaven and earth. There is, of course, a problem here, but a problem which

is solved by spiritual not by natural thought, and the difference between natural and spiritual thought is just the difference between the "Religion of Science" and real Christianity.

Lewis F. Hite.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

MODERNISM.

Modernism is one of those vague terms which have an atmosphere and an influence, but no clear and distinct, no precise or fixed, meaning. What we refer to when we use the word, is usually a spirit, an attitude, a mental disposition rather than a distinctive body of ideas or principles. It is a spirit with immense propagandist resources, partly mischievous and destructive, and partly wholesome and constructive. In spite of its vagueness and illusiveness, modernism is a real and potent factor in our own time, as it has been in times past. And there are modernists; they are, some of them at least, extremely vocal. They constitute a sect or party; but it is difficult to say who is a modernist and who is not. We are all modernists, more or less; and we are all not modernists, in some sense or other, or in some respects. We are all living in the modern world, and we identify ourselves with its distinguishing features. We indulge in contrasts, mostly vicious, between the present and the past. In short, modernism is a phase or a character of the times which is too pervasive and too various, too multitudinous in its aspects and its manifestations, to be easily comprehended or succinctly described.

Nevertheless, if we cannot say that modernism has one well-marked distinguishing feature, we may perhaps say that it has certain characters which may be observed and defined. In the first place, modernism is a state of mind which has been generated for the most part by the recent extraordinary development of the natural sciences, especially, physics, chemistry, mechanics, and biology. These sciences together with archæology have given to our view of the world a new grasp; nature and life are seen with enlarged and deepened under-

standing. The amazing developments of scientific theory, of technology, and especially of mechanical inventions, have so expanded and elated the minds of men, that we seem to have suddenly put the universe under our feet. Pride of achievement, confidence in our powers, the feeling of superiority, a consciousness of newly awakened creative energy, a superb contempt of the past, bold invasion of the future,—these seem to be the sentiments and the impulses which are moulding the thought and the life of the age; and they are characteristic ingredients of modernistic temper and expression.

But we may say further that modernism is something more than a body of sentiments and attitudes. It is even more than an uncoordinated body of views and opinions. It is a philosophy, based for the most part on the presuppositions of natural science, and upon a naturalistic interpretation of history and of life. For natural science, the universe is fitly and exhaustively described, or describable, in terms of matter and its evolution. In this view, the universe is a mechanical system in which the interplay of bodies and the energy they develop is a process without beginning or end, in accordance with the law of cause and effect. Bodies change from one into another, and energy changes from one form to another, but the total amount of matter and energy is constant; this is usually stated in the form of the laws of the Permanence of Matter, and the Conservation of Energy. These presuppositions may be held as convenient and proper working principles of scientific method; but they inevitably assume the character of metaphysical interpretations, and issue in a naturalistic philosophy. Because of the wide and deep influence of modern science, this naturalism pervades every department of current thought. So far then modernism is naturalistic; and it is naturalistic in two characteristic tendencies, the adoption of the philosophy of evolution, and of the natural history method.

Belief in evolution is the common belief of the day with reference to the history of the universe; but the meaning of the word "evolution" is by no means well defined and fixed. The doctrine of evolution, as a scientific hypothesis, or theory,

is quite legitimate as a working principle. In other words, science may well assume that, if we knew the history of the universe completely, it would be found that all the stages and events follow in a progressive order, so that we could pass from stage to stage and from event to event forward without a break, and each successive stage or event would be fully explained by the preceding, since it grew out of the preceding. This view is held for scientific purposes in cosmogony, geology, and biology, and is extended to psychology and sociology, in fact to all departments of knowledge. But it should be noted that evolution in this sense is an hypothesis or theory, not a scientific fact; it is not observed, nor is it demonstrated by experiment; it is at best an inference, an easy and natural way of interpreting observations arranged in series. The doctrine of evolution may be questioned or denied, while the observations may be accepted as correct and as corresponding to the facts. When, however, we assert that evolution is a fact, we pass from science to metaphysics; and modern science is to a considerable extent the history of the attempt to substantiate this metaphysics. Some scientific men proclaim that the attempt has been successful, and that evolution is a fact; others question and deny it. In view of this situation, we may safely remain in the attitude of independent critics, independent critics both of evolutionism and of modernism.

The doctrine of evolution as a philosophy of the universe gives extraordinary force and support to the *natural history method*. If the natural and actual process of the world is evolution, then the history of the process would be a complete account of all that can be known about it. This is precisely the assumption of the natural history method. In other words, the natural history of a series of events gives us all that can be known about the events. Here again we may say that for the purposes of Natural Science this postulate may be the convenient and proper ideal. But obviously it could hold only within the field of natural science, and on the assumption that nature is all there is; and this is naturalism pure and

simple. In so far then as modernism accepts this method as the presupposition of all its thinking, it is completely and helplessly in the domain of naturalism.

When the natural history method is applied unreservedly to the study and interpretation of the Bible, it incurs peculiarly dangerous religious consequences. No one can successfully attack the natural history method in any field, so long as it keeps to its purpose as a natural science method. When it assumes that in all cases where there is a natural history, this method is proper and adequate in the study of that history, it is quite within its rights. Even in the case of the Bible, where there is unquestionably a large field of natural history, the method is appropriate. But when it is assumed that the natural history of the Bible is alone sufficient to give us all that there is in the Bible, it follows as an inevitable consequence that the book loses its character as a source of spiritual enlightenment and authority, and becomes another example of national literature, and the record of the natural evolution of the Hebrew race. The question is, —and it is a question of the hour,—Is this assumption tenable? Can we consistently and properly maintain that the Bible is strictly and solely the product of the genius of the race and of the writers? If we can reach the final conclusion that the Bible means only what the writers put into it, that when we get the writers' thought as completely as possible, we get everything that the Bible was intended to give, then the task of reading and understanding it is merely literary and historical, and the question arises, In what respect is the Bible different from other literary and historical products, different for example from the poems of Homer, or the Dialogues of Plato, from the works of Plotinus, Thomas Aquinas, Dante, Milton, Bergson or Josiah Royce? In considering a question of this kind, we must recognize at once, and give full weight to the fact, that the Bible has a marvelous natural history, a history which it is difficult to explain on a purely naturalistic basis. First of all, we must explain the fact that the Bible has held a unique position among books for ages,

and that for generation after generation its use has brought moral and religious comfort, support, and strength, quite apart from literary enjoyment or historical interest. In other words, the Bible has a character independent of its literary and historical value. Apart from its relation to the Bible, the history of the Jewish race is comparatively insignificant. Outside the Bible, Hebrew literature is commonplace. To say that the books of the Bible as we now have them are a judicious selection from the mass of Hebrew literature may be historically true, but it does not explain the discrete difference between these books and the rest. That difference, whether real or assumed, requires explanation.

Modernism, as was remarked above, pervades many fields of interest and progress; but perhaps it comes to the sharpest issue with the sober thought of the time in the field of Biblical study and interpretation. As was said, the modernistic frame of mind has grown out of the achievements of science and the success of the scientific method. The science of the day when contrasted with that of even the recent past, and still more with that of the remote past, seems so immensely greater and more important, that the sense of superiority and the feeling of confidence are exaggerated without measure. The result is that the past seems relatively insignificant and negligible—convenient on occasion for contrast effects. When, however, we examine the positive content of modernism closely, it appears to be itself to a very large extent mere contrast effect. In other words, the present and the future have an exaggerated and vague importance as compared with a negligible and neglected past. All tradition is discounted and discredited because it is tradition; the positive and definite teachings of the past are denounced and repudiated as outworn dogmas. And we swell with pride, enjoy our self-satisfaction and our self-exaltation, amuse ourselves with the illusions of progress. We glory in our automobiles, our flying machines, and our "radios." But are we better off for all these conveniences? De we gain in moral, intellectual, and spiritual attainment in proportion

to our speed in going over the land or through the air? Is our social life the richer for talking with the members of our family or with our friends in remote cities and states? Does the minister acquire more piety, more sympathy, more spiritual intelligence making the rounds in his automobile than did the circuit-rider who made his journeys on horseback with his saddle-bags? Do our overgrown sky-scraping cities and apartment houses promote virtue, intelligence, and happiness in family and social life more than do the quiet villages, and the farm life in the open country? Count the present number of divorces per marriage, the number of child marriages, the number of suicides, the number of thefts and robberies and other crimes—compare with the time when Chicago and Detroit were villages of five hundred inhabitants. Note the motive, the equipment, and the success of the country-wide whiskey rebellion which defies both law and the government. The psychologists are proclaiming that the average development of the men and women of today is that of children between the ages of fourteen and sixteen, and this in spite of our elaborate system of education, public and private. How far modern conditions, and modernistic sentiments and ideas and practises are responsible for this state of things, it is hard to say; but it is a most serious question, and we cannot properly and safely shut our eyes to it.

But perhaps it would be better to open our eyes to the immense advantages and privileges we enjoy, and to the progress we are making. Consider the conveniences of the home and of public conveyance, the world-wide development of trade and commerce, bringing the products of all climes to our doorstep, the tremendous extension of great business corporations, which encircle the earth with their operations and give employment to millions of workers. The wealth of the world has never been so great, and we all share the benefits to some extent at least. Think of the treasures of art we have collected, the variety of amusements, the opportunities for culture, the possibilities of attainment. Books, periodicals, and newspapers were never so plentiful, nor so widely dis-

tributed, placing before every reader the thoughts and deeds of men, and the events of nature, throughout the ages, as well as the thoughts and events of our own day. Our schools cover every field of instruction and bring the wisdom of mankind to every eager and aspiring student. The discipline of modern life, the unsparing publicity, the widely extended freedom, give enlargement to our faculties, breadth and variety to our aims.

Of all these conditions, freedom and progress are the peculiar boast of modernism. We are at the top wave of evolution, with unmeasured possibilities lying ahead of us. We have thrown off the shackles of the past, and we rejoice in freedom of spirit and of expression. Progress is no doubt the law of life, though we dare not push the demand too far or venture into too much detail. Freedom is certainly life's peculiar treasure, the gift of the Divine. But freedom is conditioned. It is conditioned by restraints, and it is conditioned by choices. We are probably free from some of the restrictions and errors of the past, and we are free to choose and to do many things newly put within our reach. The question now is, not merely whether we are using our freedom to the best results, but whether we are imposing more restrictions and shutting out more significant choices than did our forefathers. To modernism, this question is not merely an offense, but it is rank heresy. Nevertheless, the question is inevitable, and we are answering it practically, if not intelligently. If we choose self-assertion, and under the name of "self-expression" indulge and justify every passing whim, emotion, or impulse, we cannot at the same time choose a life of principle, whether moral or religious. We are in all the worse case if we undertake to be systematic and consistent in self-assertion; for this is the opposite of a consistent moral and religious life; it is the inmost core of naturalism, if not of modernism, and what we mean by a life of hell. If we choose trial marriages, and insist on personal convenience, self-satisfaction, and self-expression, we shut out in that very act the choice of real marriage, moral and spiritual marriage. It

is a choice which anticipates divorce, and divorce naturally follows. We cannot choose economic independence, or personal independence, and at the same time choose complete devotion to marriage and to family life; for this is the very essence of a life of service, and service puts self in the second place. If we choose complete devotion to merchandize, we shut out the choice of agriculture, the ministry, music, drama, literature, law, medicine, teaching, engineering, and the rest. Some of us may be fortunate enough to be able to choose both vocation and avocation, but we cannot avoid the inevitable conflict between the two. The lesson of all this, and more to the same effect, is, that our freedom is limited in the very act of choice. On the other hand, our freedom is hedged in with countless negatives. We are not free to turn our back on the past. The most determined and consistent effort to do this was made by Descartes, and he fell back at once into the net of Aristotelianism, and then marched obediently in the line of tradition. We are not free to eat fire, nor even to drink "fire-water," without suffering the penalty; we are not free to walk across the lake, nor to climb the north pole. In short, our freedom, like our consciousness and our rationality, is the body of our life. The large part of our life is unconscious, irrational, and irresponsible. In our boastful moods it is well to be reminded of this, and to be brought back to the solid ground of experience.

Perhaps, many of the extravagances of modernism are incidental to our progress and happiness; they are concessions to imperfect and incipient humanity. But there is one field in which modernism threatens the foundations of the Christian religion. It was indicated above that modernism is a peculiarly aggressive form of naturalism. Natural law and especially the law of evolution are the primary articles of faith, and according to this faith all human experience and all history are to be interpreted and explained. This principle is applied to the interpretation of the Bible. The presupposition is that the natural history of the Bible gives us all the knowledge we can have of it. Archæology, geology, biology, linguistic, ethical, political, and religious history have trained students and scholars in the

use of the natural history method, and with fruitful results. It was inevitable that this method should be applied to the history of the Bible. The Bible, of course, has a natural history. The books were written by certain persons at certain times. We may properly and usefully learn what we can about the writers and the times in which they lived, in order to know as fully as possible the meaning for the writers of what they wrote. But to conclude that the whole meaning for us must be precisely what it was for the writers, is to reduce the Bible to mere natural history. This is what the natural history method leads to, and what modernism maintains.

The method proceeds according to the commonly accepted principles. In the first place, the Bible is taken as a body of national history and literature. The writers were representatives of their times and of the corresponding stages of race development, and as such they wrote out their thoughts, the results of their observations, reflections, and interpretations. What they wrote was the expression of their own thoughts, and can mean for us no more than what it meant for them, what they intended it to mean. When therefore we have ascertained this meaning, our task as interpreters is finished. Furthermore, according to the method, the Bible is the record of the evolution of the Hebrew race; in particular of the spiritual life of the race and of its idea of God. The Hebrew race, so it is said, began on comparatively low moral and spiritual levels, and with primitive and undeveloped ideas of God, and proceeded stage by stage, and from level to level, until the evolution culminated in the character and life of Jesus Christ. In short, the view is, that the Bible is the product of the evolution of a race endowed with unparalleled moral and spiritual gifts, and that the writers were the finest flower of these gifts.

Now granting that we can trace some of this kind of progress, and that we may recognize in the writers peculiar gifts, we must note that as a fact the writers do not speak for themselves; on the contrary, they speak in express terms the "Word of the Lord." The oft repeated formula is "the Word of the

Lord came unto me saying," or "God spake unto Moses saying." These phrases must be taken into account. We may dispose of them by the natural history method as merely indicating a low conception of God,—call it anthropomorphic or what not; but the fact of the language remains, and the whole character and meaning of the Bible lies in its full significance. For it raises the final question, whether the Bible is the Word of God or not, and in what sense is it the Word of God,—a question which involves the fate of Christianity. The question cannot be answered in naturalistic terms; it must be answered in the light of a spiritual understanding of language and of life, and especially in the light of a fuller knowledge of the relation between the natural and the spiritual, and of the relation between the spiritual and the Divine. These relations are described and explained in the Doctrine of Correspondence, a systematic and comprehensive doctrine of the relation between the natural and the spiritual. In the light of this doctrine we are able to see clearly and to say positively that in the strictest sense the Bible is the Word of God. It is the task of the Church to expound this doctrine and to interpret the Bible in the light of it.

LEWIS F. HITE.

LOYALTY TO TRUTH.

In a number of places Swedenborg tells us that nothing is of more importance to a man than to know what is true*; for it is by a life in conformity with truth that he is born again; and unless he is born again, he does not attain the end for which he was created, namely, heaven.

Just as the Lord while on earth stated that but few were saved in that age, so Swedenborg clearly stated that in his day but few Christians were saved. How far spiritual conditions have changed during the intervening century and a half no mortal knows.

---

* Nothing can be received from the Lord and from heaven by any one who is not in truths. (Heaven and Hell, n. 371.)

Of those not being regenerated at any time, Swedenborg informs us that it makes no difference to them whether they know truth, or not. But it makes a vast difference to those who are to be saved; for a man is reformed and regenerated through the knowledge of the truths of faith; i. e., doctrinal things concerning eternal life, the Lord's Kingdom, and the Lord, as contained in the Word. "It is through the truths of faith, the Lord operating in charity, that man is regenerated" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1077). Now, of himself man is unable to acquire knowledge of spiritual truths; his faculties are not suited to such attainment. In final analysis knowledge of spiritual truth is imparted to him by revelation. Similarly, he cannot attain to the new birth by any intellectual activity of his own. On the contrary, regeneration is effected by the Lord alone in such as receive the truths He has revealed, and live accordingly. All are born unregenerate; the Lord saves all who will allow themselves to be saved; and those allow themselves to be saved who accept the truths He has provided, and live a life of love to Him and to the neighbor. There is no other way.

The principal function of the Church is to assist in the regeneration of men. We are told that

> The Church specifically exists where the Word is found, and the Lord is known thereby, consequently where Divine Truths have been revealed. Still those who are born where the Word exists, and where the Lord is known, are not on that account of the Church; but those are, who, through truths from the Word, are being regenerated by the Lord. (Heavenly Doctrine, n. 246.)

We should pay due attention to such statements as these, lest we assume that we are being regenerated and saved merely because we have been born in a so-called Christian community, and are members of a church body. Such things are no assurance whatever that we are regenerating; and such an assumption may involve solifidianism pure and simple.

As the main function of the Church is to assist in the regeneration of men, and as a knowledge of spiritual truth is essential to regeneration, therefore it is the first duty of the Church as an historic institution to treasure and safeguard

the truth entrusted to it. As a matter of fact we all know that historically the Christian Church has departed far from that truth. Its scholars have devised false doctrines that have led multitudes astray. The perverted doctrines of most of the churches of our day are the results of centuries of development and change; and in any history of doctrine, they find their proper places. But, though arising on a background of such doctrine, the doctrines of the New Church are not so much in the line of historic development drifting indifferently by, as apart from it. They represent a new start in the spiritual history of humanity. We should note that by them the foundations of the Christian Church have been laid anew. This fact needs to be acknowledged and emphasized. The doctrines of the New Church constitute the means of initiating a new era in the spiritual history of mankind.

Every organized church has officers to attend to the promotion of its functions. The principal officers of a church are commonly called clergymen or ministers. Swedenborg says concerning the duty of clergymen that

> They ought to teach men the way to heaven, and also to lead them. They ought to teach them according to the doctrine of their Church from the Word; and they ought to lead them to live according to it. Those who teach truths, and thereby lead to the good of life, and thus to the Lord, are good shepherds of the sheep; but those who teach, and do not lead to the good of life, and thus to the Lord, are bad shepherds. (Heavenly Doctrine, n. 315.)

It is evident then that the duty of ministers is to give such attention as they can to the welfare of the souls of their congregation individually and collectively, both by personal touch and by their ministrations in the pulpit. And they should ever be mindful of the fact that the Holy Spirit operates solely by means of Divine truths from the Word (True Christian Religion, n. 142), and that "the Lord speaks with the man of the Church by the Word only." (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 10,290, 10,375e). Of course this does not mean the language of Scripture necessarily.

A liberal education is a prime requisite in the preparation of a man for the ministry, especially if he is to serve a truly

cultured community; but even more fundamental for the average minister is ripe understanding of the Word and of the Heavenly Doctrines,—not undigested memory-knowledge, with facile quotation and abundant reference, but assimilated ideas and principles. And he should have knowledge, theoretical and actual, of what constitutes regeneration. If he be not regenerate, he will have no adequate understanding of real truth (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 671). He may be a right nice fellow, in the popular acceptation of that term; but if he has not adequate knowledge of spiritual things, and if his life is not in conformity with spiritual truth, he cannot be a good minister; he cannot serve his congregation effectively as a guide to the heavenly life. It is evident, then, that the ministers of the New Church should have as thorough a knowledge of the Word as is practicable, and that they should be as thoroughly imbued with the spiritual interpretation of the Word and with a knowledge of correct doctrine as is possible. It matters relatively little what congregations may desire in a minister besides such knowledge; the thing that the members *need* first of all is soul guidance; and the fundamental knowledge for such a guide to possess is to be obtained mainly from the Word and Swedenborg. It would be well for the Church if, instead of a meagre three years of special training for their work, our ministers were put through such a prolonged period of preparation as the Jesuits have to go through before they are thought worthy of full priesthood. Prominence of young men in the ministry is no sign of a healthy condition in a church organization.

As already stated, a minister "ought to teach his parishioners according to the doctrines of their Church from the Word" (Heavenly Doctrine, n. 315). We regret to say that fragmentary evidence keeps coming to our attention that our ministers occasionally express views that are not in harmony with that precept. Some seem to think that the foundations of our faith have been rendered shaky by recent science and modern thought; and they even say so openly. To some Psychoanalysis, the New Psychology, the Higher Criticism, etc., are apparently as important for them as a

thorough knowledge of the Word and Swedenborg's Writings. Some again even make remarks minimizing the importance of Swedenborg, and expressing doubts about some of the things disclosed by him,—even doubts as to his complete sanity. They even say, more or less openly, that when Swedenborg affirms that the Word has providentially been preserved to us through the ages, he is affirming what is not so,—this in spite of the fact that Swedenborg had knowledge of the Word as it exists in heaven as well as on earth. One, alas, has been openly advocating the pantheistic doctrine that all men are parts of God; furthermore, that each one of us has the Christ principle in him, so that every individual is potentially a Christ. Universalist sentiments are not uncommon; and in such cases, of course, the eternity of the hells is practically rejected. (In this connection we may mention that within the last twenty years two of our former ministers have allied themselves with the Universalist Church.) One again has expressed in print the idea that mere transition into the other life constitutes the second birth. Occasionally we are made aware that there is more or less hedging from the idea that the Writings of Swedenborg are a veritable revelation. The distinctiveness of the New Church is frequently blurred by those who emphasize the permeation theory overmuch; and they talk about "all true Christians" as though abundant in all denominations.

But when we come to speak of permeation, we need a special paragraph, for it works both ways. While it is very difficult to get any satisfactory evidence as to how far the spiritual truths of Swedenborg's teachings have permeated into the general knowledge of well-informed men, there is excellent evidence that another kind of permeation, concerning which Swedenborg himself cautions us, has been going on, not only among our laity but also among our clergy. In this connection we may fittingly quote a few thoughts from a New-Church leaflet published a short time ago. After a reference to "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 884, and "True Christian Religion," n. 619, the following sentences occur:

The dragon is represented in the Apocalypse as "persecuting the woman who brought forth the man-child." Now, the *woman* is the New Church; the Man-Child is the Divine Truth, that is, the new Revelation given to the New Church. The vision signifies that the dragon will exert itself to infest the New Church by its influence, and it is also written that *many* shall be seduced. That is to say, the mental attitude of many in the New Church shall be seduced and brought under subjection to the spiritual spheres of the perverted and devastated Christianity of to-day. The penetration of the influence *into the midst* of the New Church is what we call "The dragonistic permeation" . . .

The sphere by which many in the New Church seem to be most easily affected is the sphere that insinuates scepticism concerning the Revelation of the New Church itself . . .

It is sufficient to read certain articles published in Journals which call themselves New Church, in order to see the influence that the sphere emanating from these dragonistic ultra-subjectivists has in the minds of the authors of these articles, and that, consequently, "dragonistic permeation" is not an illusory thing. We find, in fact, that some of these writers and theologians of the New Church treat the New Revelation given by the Lord to the New Church in the same way that the above-mentioned dragonists treat the Old and New Testament Scriptures; that they look upon the Lord's Second Advent as the dragonists look upon the Resurrection of our Lord. In fact, they seem to claim that the Lord's Second Advent is not an event accomplished in the Revelation given by the Lord to the New Church, and, in spite of the formal teaching of the Writings on which the New Church is founded, they refuse to give to the Second Advent of the Lord the value of an accomplished fact. For some of them, too, all is ultra-subjective! . . .

Spiritually and theologically extravagant, they seriously declare that the writings of the New Church, though they on the whole are a Divine Revelation, nevertheless lack Divine authority, and in consequence, they are of the opinion that they can reject all in this Revelation which does not accord with their personal sentiments, with their prejudices, and with the lucubrations of their minds.

This is obviously a criticism from an extreme position; but it can do us no harm to know that some New-Churchmen express such opinions.

There is a passage in the "Arcana Cœlestia" that occurs to us in this connection:

[It is according to order] to enter from truths into rational and

scientific things; but [contrary to order] to enter from scientific and rational things into truth . . . From which it is evident how important it is that truths be known and believed; for man is enlightened by truths, and is blinded by falsities. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2588.)

As to falsities, they are exceedingly abundant on every hand about us; and the writings of the world's most eminent and scholarly men are full of them. But such men are all pygmies compared with Swedenborg. To convince our ministers of that fact it would be well if a course in comparative biography of great religious leaders, with full study of the life of Swedenborg and the development of his mind, were given in our Theological School.

In view of the thoughts we have been considering, it is manifestly important that, if we are members of the New Church organization, we should every once in a while examine our moorings to see if we are drifting, and whither. We need to be reminded again and again what the New Church stands for. If we are members of any part of the General Convention of the New Jerusalem, we need to recall that we belong to a body that acknowledges "the doctrines of the New Church as revealed by the Lord God the Savior Jesus Christ in His Word by means of the theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg."

In this connection it is interesting to note what happened to Swedenborg's own beliefs during the few years that may be spoken of as his transition period. It will be remembered that he had been brought up in the Swedish Lutheran Church, of which his father became an honored bishop; and that he was a member of that Church at the time we are considering, indeed even to the end of his life on earth. But his writings, especially his personal note-books, show, that his doctrinal beliefs underwent a profound change during the years between 1743 and 1750. It was during this period that he acquired abundant knowledge of the internal sense of the Word; and in his "Heavenly Doctrine," n. 260, he tells us:

The internal sense is the very doctrine of the Church. Those who

understand the Word according to the internal sense, are acquainted with the true doctrine itself of the Church, because the internal sense contains it.

In other words, by acquiring the knowledge of that sense himself, he acquired a knowledge of true doctrine. No one else has ever had such knowledge of the internal sense as he. No one else has ever had such knowledge of true doctrine as he. No one else is so competent a teacher of spiritual truth as he. Having learned truth of the Lord and of the angels of Heaven, he is the world's chief spokesman of truth.

The New Church as an institution in this world stands emphatically and unquestionably upon the authority of Swedenborg.

There is no use in trying to dodge the word "authority." It can't be done. Man is wholly unable to discover spiritual truth of himself. The dreary wastes of philosophy and false theology are sufficient evidence of that fact. Except to the regenerate there is no perception of spiritual truth. The unregenerate man doesn't know what spiritual truth is, and what it is not. Indeed, every philosophic thinker knows that there is no criterion for truth of a spiritual nature. Even of a believer in the Divinity of the Word it is legitimate to ask why he believes it to be true. If he replies that it is true because the Lord has said so, we can take no exception to that reason, if satisfactory to himself; but it may be far from satisfactory to us. But when we find Swedenborg saying practically the same thing, and giving proof that the Word is different from any human production, then, as we come to understand and acknowledge his demonstration, we come to personal conviction that the Word is truth. With that conviction comes certainty that Swedenborg was what he claimed to be, the revelator of the Lord in His Second Coming to man at the beginning of this new age. The evidence is adequate that he was chosen by the Lord for his commission, that he was instructed, enlightened, illumined for its performance; that as the Lord is Truth Itself, so Swedenborg was commissioned by Truth Itself to make spiritual truth known in abundance to man. But for Swedenborg (or someone

else in his stead, taken in hand by the Lord, and instructed in angelic wisdom as he was instructed) we should have practically no knowledge of the internal sense of the Word, and no knowledge of New-Church doctrines as such. Moreover, we should have no ability to discover and organize such a body of spiritual knowledge; and we should not now be in possession of that wealth of spiritual truth stamped with approval more than human. And it is also certain that there would be no New Church. In short, it is essential that Swedenborg be recognized as our authority for truth. We cannot get away from it; Swedenborg is our authority.

We are all familiar with the statement that the three essentials of the New Church are (1) the acknowledgment of the Divinity of the Lord, (2) the acknowledgment of the Holiness of the Word, and (3) the Life which is called Charity. There are many people besides those of the New-Church organization who would agree that those are the essentials of the Christian religion; and when such persons manifest their faith by their lives, we can assume that they also are of that invisible body, the Lord's Church. But when we are speak-speaking of the organization known as the New Church, there are other essentials that have to be mentioned: for the organized New Church stands emphatically and unequivocally for the canon of Scripture as set forth by Swedenborg; for the interpretation of the Word as set forth by Swedenborg; for the theological doctrines as set forth by Swedenborg; for information concerning the spiritual world as set forth by Swedenborg; these, and other things. Unless these things are acknowledged by an individual, he cannot be considered a loyal member of the organized New Church; for loyalty involves a matter of faith, in the usual acceptance of that term. To the extent that an individual demurs at the authority of Swedenborg in any of these particulars, to that extent he is in a spirit unfriendly in some measure to New-Church principles. To the extent that such a person accepts the teachings of Swedenborg, he may be called a Swedenborgian;

but only as a member of the organization professes general acceptance of all the essentials of the New Church, and evidences such acceptance in his life, can we feel reasonably assured of his New-Churchmanship.

In short and finally, for a New-Churchman loyalty to the truth involves loyalty to the Lord in His Word, and loyalty to Swedenborg as the Lord's revelator of spiritual truth.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

TEMPTATIONS OF JESUS.

The Gospels tell us that Jesus suffered temptations, during forty days immediately following His baptism by John in the river Jordan. It is these temptations which the Church especially remembers during the Lenten season. The traditional scene of the temptations is among the barren cliffs bordering the Jordan valley, behind Jericho, toward the northern end of the wilderness of Judæa. Three temptations are described: to make the stones His bread; to cast Himself from the pinnacle of the temple, trusting to be held up by angels' hands; and to gain the kingdoms of the world by worshiping the devil. We feel as we read this narrative that it means more than appears in the letter. Like the parables which our Lord spoke, this account which He left with the disciples evidently contains deeper knowledge of the Lord's temptations than the disciples could then receive or understand. We must expect the narrative to unfold its meaning, as, with some experience of temptations ourselves, we become able to learn of the much deeper and severer temptations of the Lord.

We notice also the words with which the account of these days in the wilderness in Luke's Gospel closes. "When the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season." "For a season!" There were then returns of temptation—other times when tendencies of the nature which the Lord shared with men, were aroused, with suggestions of gaining worldly honor, of saving Himself rather than giving Himself utterly for the saving of men; suggestions of easier ways of accomplishing His task; the impulse to compel men to accept His help; times of doubt whether success was pos-

sible, of loneliness and despair. There were times when the tempter returned, when forces of evil, worse than the hunger or the wild beasts of the desert, assailed Him. The Gospels give us glimpses of these trials. After the feeding of the five thousand, the Lord perceived that they would come and take Him by force to make him a King; he sent the multitudes away, and the disciples, and went into a mountain alone to pray. Was this excitement of worldly thoughts a return of the temptation of the kingdoms of the world? And after the prayer, He came to the disciples walking on the sea.

Again we read, "And it came to pass in those days that He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God." We do not know how frequent were these seasons when in prayer alone the Lord subdued the promptings of evil and the powers of hell that urged them, and found strength and peace in a fuller sense of oneness with the Divine.

Two experiences of temptation toward the end of the Gospel story are conspicuous: the night of prayer in the garden of Gethsemane; and the temptation of the cross. In those last days in Jerusalem, we see the hostility of the leaders growing against the Lord. Pharisees and Herodians and Sadducees were plotting to entangle Him in His talk; the chief priests and the traitor disciple were conspiring to seize Him. And we feel that this banding together of hostile men is only a faint suggestion of the banding together of the hosts of hell which realized that it was between Him and them a life and death struggle for the world: "Come, let us kill Him," they said, "and the inheritance shall be ours." "This is your hour," He said, "and the power of darkness." The intensity of the struggle in Gethsemane we feel in the Gospel narrative, even if we cannot understand fully the temptation. The Lord clung to the sympathy of the disciples, but even the three nearest to Him fell asleep as He went beyond them into the shadows and three times prayed that if it were possible the cup might pass from Him. He prayed so earnestly, that His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.

This temptation among the olives, at the place of the oil presses, must have been a breaking and crushing of all selfish hindrance and limitation, that the oil of the Divine love might come forth in purity and fulness. It was there at Gethsemane that the Lord rebuked Peter for using force against Judas and his men, and bade him put up his sword. Was the victory which the Lord Himself was gaining, the victory over the disposition, so natural to us all, to force our will on others, in the effort to do them good? Was the cup which was so hard for Him to accept the cup of patience, that no selfishness might hinder the flow of perfect love? After the prayer in the garden, the Lord was strong with a calmness and strength which Judas and his band felt when, as Jesus stepped forward to meet them, they went backward and fell to the ground.

And the last temptation of the cross. How the great loneliness of that hour stands out, the sense of separation from the Divine and from the inward strength, in the words of the Psalm which the Lord then uttered: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Both Psalm and Gospel set forth vividly the desolation of that hour, with the cruelty suffered at the hands of soldiers, and the still more cruel taunts of priests and people. Yet there are indications of victory and a great inward peace, in the prayer of mercy, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do"; in the words of gentleness to the penitent thief, and to the mother Mary and the disciple John. And the Psalm of crucifixion closes with triumph and rejoicing.

There is this brief mention of temptations in the Lord's life, in the letter of the Gospels. But, all told there is little indication of the great conflicts which He endured with all the powers of evil, and the victories which He gained. There was no parade of sorrow in His life. He fasted as He taught us to fast, anointing the head and washing the face, that we appear not unto men to fast, but unto our Father Who is in heaven.

Yet there was need that some little of the Lord's tempta-

tion should appear to those about Him, and should be recorded in the Gospels. Otherwise how should we know how completely the Lord entered into all human experience and shared our human life with us, even to its temptations from all forms of evil and its attacks from all the influences of hell? How else should we know His sympathy, and be assured of His willingness and His power to help? The apostles felt it, and one wrote:

> For we have not one high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities: but was in all points tempted as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need. (Hebrews iv, 15, 16.)

We long for, and we need, the sense of the Lord's nearness, of His sharing of our trials, of His sympathy with us in all our troubles. Some persons have been ready to give up belief in the Lord's Divineness, that they might keep Him near, and be sure of His sympathy as a Friend. We long for this sympathy, and we need it, nor should belief in the Lord's Divineness take it from us. What the Gospels show us of His temptations gives us the assurance that we need.

And when we are able to go further, and to learn more of the Lord's temptations without losing sight of His Divineness, we find it in the Old Testament; in Psalms of temptation, like the crucifixion Psalm; in histories of warfare and sacrifice, as in Abram's warfare and his sacrifice of Isaac. And in chapters of the prophets, as in Jonah, and his prayer from the belly of hell—for the Lord accepted Jonah as a type of Himself and of His laying down of life; and in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, which gives so strong and tender a picture of the Lord's suffering for our sake.

> Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? . . .
>
> Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows. . . .
>
> But he was wounded for our transgressions: he was bruised for our iniquities. . . .
>
> He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth. . . .

He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

As the Lord grants us this fuller knowledge of His trials in Moses and the prophets and the Psalms, saying, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory?" all the more we feel how in sharing our nature with us He was open to all temptations, attended with all the suffering of temptations, all the doubt as to the outcome, all the despair. We are prepared for the following teaching of our doctrines:

From His earliest childhood, even to the last hour of His life in the world, [the Lord] was assaulted by all the hells, which were continually overcome, subjugated, and conquered by Him; and this solely out of love for the whole human race. And because this love was not human but Divine, and all temptation is great in proportion as the love is great, it may be seen how grievous were His combats, and how great the ferocity with which the hells assailed him. (Arcania Cœlestia, n. 1690.)

The prediction of the Lord's temptations in the Old Testament would seem to have been a guide and strength to the Lord in meeting the trials of His life and accomplishing His saving work. In Gethsemane He said, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" And it gives us when we can profit by it a wonderful insight into the conflicts and victories of the Lord. We are also taught that the knowledge of the Lord's life contained in the deeper meaning of the Old Testament is most precious to the angels. But the Gospels, not obscuring His Divineness, reveal enough of the Lord's temptations to show how fully the Lord stood with us in the trials of this world's life; how full and how intimate is His sympathy with us in all our trials.

And with this revealing of the Lord's temptations, of His sympathy, of His nearness and His help, comes the impulse to be faithful in trials for His sake. In telling the disciples of His coming trials and death, He warned them that they also must suffer trials. "The servant is not above his mas-

ter; if they have persecuted me they will also persecute you." None could be His disciples who were not ready to take up their cross and follow Him; who were not ready to lay down their life for Him.

But with the certainty of trials and temptations in following the Lord, is the certainty of His companionship in trial; the certainty of His victory and of His power to help. "Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations," the Lord said to the twelve at the table of the last supper, "and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me." It was but a very little way that the apostles had been able to go with Him in His trials, or that they were able that night to go with Him in His trial in Gethsemane; but the Lord in that tender saying points to the possibility of victory and to the way of victory for us all. Our protection and our deliverance in our trials, our victory in our temptations, depend upon our remembering His nearness and companionship in trial, His sympathy; upon our remembering His faithfulness for our sake, the completeness of His victory, and the fulness of His power to help. If we remember His sympathy in trial, if we do our part and ask His help, we cannot fail; His Divine love is toward us, His Divine power fights for us and works for us; we shall succeed. "Ye are they that have continued with me in my temptations; and I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me."

It is important for us to know and acknowledge our Lord's Divineness, as it is made real to us in His mighty works and living words, in His Divine birth, in His transfiguration, His resurrection, and ascension. But it is equally necessary for us to know the Lord's nearness to us in our human weakness, our sufferings and trials; His companionship and sympathy in all our states of human need; and this we learn from what the Scripture tells us of His temptations, His days in the wilderness, His nights of prayer, the agony of Gethsemane and the cross. There is no irreverence in the thought of companionship with Jesus. He came into the world that we

might have it; He endured all that we might have it; He has been willing to share our sorrows and our trials, to be touched by the feeling of our infirmities, to be tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin, that we might have it. "Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." The Lord asks no other reward for all His trials, but this opportunity to be our companion in our trials, our help at hand in every time of need.

WILLIAM L. WORCESTER.

THE RATIONAL.

The first step towards the study of the rational faculty is a general grasp of the construction of the whole man, of which the rational is only a part. And to me the starting-point in any study of the mind is the acceptance of the great truth that we have no life of our own, but are simply recipients of life from the Lord. That means that we cannot think or love or act of ourselves—all love, all thought, flows in. We are, in the final analysis, merely vessels wonderfully formed to receive life from God. That, much as it may be distasteful to our pride, is undeniably true. We cannot hope to understand ourselves without first realizing that great corner-stone of all right-thinking.

But we are astonishingly wonderful "vessels," even at that. We are not merely "containers" into which life is poured as water is poured into a pitcher. Rather, we are like the wonderful radio apparatus. Look at it,—a maze of wires and tubes and batteries! All dead substances. Turn the proper indicator, and the thing seems to spring into life. It speaks. It fills the room with harmonies of orchestra or band. Look inside. Nothing there to *cause* the music, to *cause* the sound of the voice. No; the radio is a wonderul arrangement of substances created to *receive* sound, and pass it on.

And notice! It is not restricted to any particular sounds. A turn of the indicator, and we hear someone talking in New

York. Still another turn, and we hear the orchestra in Buffalo. Still another turn, and then strains of the band at Fort Worth, Texas, fill the room. What do the turns of the indicator do? They change the arrangement of the parts of the radio machine. When the parts are arranged in a certain way, we hear New York. When a different arrangement is brought about, we hear Buffalo. Still another change, and we hear Fort Worth.

So we may gain some slight conception of the wonderful organism which we call a human being. True, the illustration is faulty, as all attempts to compare mental and spiritual things with purely material things must always be, but the illustration will serve. For a human being is a marvelous creation, so formed as to be able to receive love and wisdom from God; and so formed that the combination of parts is infinite. For example: the parts may be so arranged that we hear the harmonies of heaven, and actually partake of the joy and happiness there; or the parts may be so arranged that the discords of hell flow in, and we feel and experience the life there; and between the life of the highest heaven and that of the lowest hell there is an infinitude of possibilities—messages, music, discords, too numerous even to suggest. And we, as human beings, have the power to "tune-in" so as to receive any one of these messages. We "create" none of this life, but we *do* determine how we shall arrange the wonderful parts of our "receiving sets," so as to receive the "messages" we desire.

Clearly there is but one supreme object of life on earth,—to learn to arrange this wonderful organism of ours so that only the harmonies of heaven shall be received, and those messages we do not desire shall be "cut out."

In "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 657, we are told something about the manner in which these messages, from the Lord as the Author of all joy and happiness and knowledge and love, come down to us. In that number we are told the order of influx, as it is when man is regenerated, that is, when his "receiving-apparatus" is correctly adjusted, if you will.

First, the life from God. That is the starting-point. This life is first received by man as love to God and the neighbor; "voluntary things" as they are called in another place, also "celestial things."

Next, the life appears and gives activity to "intellectual things"; which means that the love is now conjoined to truth, and that there is the desire to conjoin the good and the true in life. But how? That brings us to the third step—the rational.

It is in the rational faculty, or, more correctly, upon the rational plane, that we consciously reason about things. And the life, still flowing downward from the spiritual, enters this rational plane, and enables us to reason correctly, and to see just how love to the Lord and the neighbor can be carried out in the life. It shows us the true value of the things of the earth-life.

The next descent of the life which started from God, is into the plane of the scientific—the plane of nature and her laws. There it so arranges things that the original love may find its full expression in everyday life,—in the building of bridges, the making of homes, the proper marriage relationship on the physical plane, the best form of civil government, and so forth.

So we have the true order of influx from God. Starting with love to God and the neighbor, it descends through successive stages, in each case flowing from the higher into the next lower, and arranging things there in conformity with itself, until the final goal is reached—the perfect submission of the lowest to the highest,—the very sensuous serving the love of God and the neighbor.

"Order is, that the celestial, through the spiritual, should let itself into the rational, and thence into the scientific," we are told in "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 1475. Also, in number 657, we read: "Without influx of the Lord's life into the things of the will, and through these into the things of the understanding, into things of the rational, and into memory-knowledges, life would be impossible to man."

But we have been talking about a man whose organism, or inner self, is in perfect order. Unfortunately our forefathers seem to have been experimenting with the machinery of our "receiving-set," and to have put it very much out of order. So, when we are born, we find ourselves in possession of a very imperfect piece of mental and affectional machinery. And in order to set things right—in order to repair the damage, we have to pass through some exceedingly serious temptations. For see! The "machinery" does not happen to be outside of ourselves, as is the radio set. It *is* ourselves. And we have to undergo some very strenuous twisting and turning, in the process of setting the parts in order again. That is regeneration.

Now, just what has the foolish experimenting on the part of our forefathers brought about? It has brought about the closing up of all the regions of the mind above the natural. There is no longer possible that influx from above, into the things of the lowest plane, which is needed to enable us to See their true value. Instead, love of evil flows in, through the hells, and takes control. It pounces upon every truth which is presented, and perverts it into falsity, so as to make it agree with and support the evil. The thief believes that stealing is the very best method of securing the good things of life, and there is little use telling him to the contrary, as long as the evil is in control. Why? Because that evil will refuse to let him believe it. The girl on the street believes that there is more pleasure in a loose life than in purity. Why? Because before regeneration, only the lower plane—the plane of the sensuous, is open with such a person. Information gathered by the senses is taken as the basis of belief and the guide of life. In such a state, only what the senses tell us is believed. The pleasures the sense-appetites give are held to be "good"; and all reasoning, such as it is, is done from that basis. Regarding spiritual things, we are from heredity totally blind, and would be hopelessly lost, but for the "remains" implanted by the Lord, and carefully guarded from the debasing influence of the evil will.

Clearly the remedy for this condition of things is the forming of a faculty or power to reason, which shall be free from the enslavement of the corrupt, evil will. We must be enabled to lift our thoughts above the will, and view the natural plane impartially and without prejudice. Some faculty is needed which shall act as a sort of jury, free from outside (or really inside) influence. That faculty is called the "True Rational." It is the power God gives us to rise above ourselves, as it were, and view ourselves and the truths of this and the higher life without the tainting, perverting influence of the evil will. Since the light cannot come down from the spiritual into the natural to place things in proper order, because the way has been closed, therefore the truths in the memory must be lifted up, and formed into a faculty of their own. Here is what Swedenborg tells us regarding the effect of evil and the formation of the rational:

> If man were born into no hereditary evil, the rational would be born immediately from the marriage of the celestial things of the internal man with the spiritual, and through the rational would be born the scientific, so that man would have with him all the rational and all the scientific the moment he came into the world; for this is according to the order of influx. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1902.)
>
> Hereditary evil is the cause that man's rational must be formed through the scientific and knowledges insinuated through the senses, thus in inverted order. Man is thus made rational miraculously by the Lord.

Here, then, is a picture of the rational, together with its use. It is a sort of medium, or connecting-link between the spiritual or internal above, and the external or natural below. It is open to both spiritual and natural, a sort of middle chamber connecting with those above and below. Indeed it is to express this very fact that Solomon built three chambers, or stories, to the Temple; to represent the natural, the rational, and the spiritual planes of the mind. Also, in the building of the ark, there were three stories, with a "window" to admit light, in the middle story. That middle story was, of course, the rational, through which "light" or truth is admitted into the lower from the upper.

Now, how is this wonderful rational formed? When we open our eyes as little babes, we find ourselves possessed of certain physical powers. We can touch, taste, see, smell and hear. These faculties help us to gather a great fund of information about material things, the world in which we live. Later we are told many things about God, the Word, the life after death, the difference between right and wrong, and so on. All this is stored up in our memories, and held as "memory-knowledges." In and of itself this great fund of knowledge is useless, except to enable us to make ourselves comfortable in this world.

As we advance in years, into boyhood and youth, there comes the affection for knowing. The child develops a great thirst for knowledge. He drinks it in as a sponge absorbs water, and at first to no better purpose. That is the "learning stage." Let parents keep this fact in mind, when inclined to become impatient with the child. The child *must* learn. This fact also helps us to understand the necessity of teaching children the Word.

The great value of this development is seen when we learn that into the *affection* for knowing which animates the child at that time, the Lord can, and does, cause to inflow something from the internal, which has been waiting, as it were, for the means of reaching the external, or lower. And these two, the affection for knowing and the life of the internal, are united in the bringing about the birth of the first rational. We are told:

> The rational is born from the internal man as a father, and the external man as a mother. . . . The rational is not born, as is supposed, from *knowledges,* but from the affection of knowledges. The affection is the maternal life itself, and the celestial and spiritual *in the affection* is the paternal life. Scientifics and knowledges, in themselves, are dead things, and are vivified by the life of the affection. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1895.)
>
> The first rational can be formed only through the influx of the internal into the affection for knowledges of the external. (Ibid., n. 2093. The italics are mine.)
>
> The first rational is procured through the experiences of the senses, through reflection upon the things of moral and civil life, through

knowledges and reasonings from them, and by means of them; and also from knowledges of spiritual things from the doctrines of faith and the Word. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2657.)

The weakness of this first rational is, of course, that it is so earth-bound. Its "mother" is the mere affection for knowing, and the things of which it is formed are drawn largely from the impressions of the senses. Even the knowledges of religion, learned from the Word and doctrine, are interpreted at this time in terms of the sense-life. And above all, there is a lack of genuine love of the good, which the higher regions alone can transmit from God. Such is the first rational.

The next step is the opening of the True Rational. And here is a most important truth. The True Rational can be opened only through the living of what little knowledge of spiritual things the first rational can receive. For see! The first rational *does* enable us to lift our thoughts above the influence of the perverted will, and pass judgment upon the affections of that will. That is its real mission. And this, together with the new desires we receive from and through the "remains" stored up in infancy and childhood, which are the first starting of the new will, makes it possible for the laying of the foundation of the genuine rational. Notice what the Writings tell us on this point:

As soon as man acknowledges his evils as sins against God, and wills to desist from them, the Lord opens the spiritual mind, and enters into the rational, and from the rational it disposes into order those things in the natural which are contrary to order. This is what appears to man as combat.

And in "Heaven and Hell," n. 468, we read: "The rational is not formed and opened from truths by means of knowing them, but by living according to them." It is the first rational which enables us to see the truths, freed from the influence and perversion of the evil will, and the "remains" which give us the desire to live them.

As soon, therefor, as we really seek to live the Commandments, which up to this stage have been simply held as memory-knowledge, the Lord can perform the miracle of opening

the spiritual plane, which has so far been closed. This is the plan or region of the inner life, where genuine truth from God is conjoined with genuine love from Him. It is here where the true marriage takes place. We are told:

The true rational is conceived through the conjunction of the truth of the internal man with the good of the same, and the influx of the good into the truth.

The genuine rational is born of the influx of good and truth from the Lord, through the internal man. This second rational is received from the Lord when the man is being regenerated.

Thus into this love of gathering knowledge and of reasoning about it, and the fund of knowledge we have gathered, the Lord causes to inflow knowledge of genuine truth and affection for genuine good. These are the "father" and "mother" of the True Rational. And they flow into the first rational, and select there whatever is true, and make use of that in the formation of the new son which is being formed; and whatever is contrary to the truth there they cast aside; and whatever is according to appearances, they interpret in the light of genuine truth. See, again, what the Writings have to tell us, on that point:

The rational, after regeneration, is formed by the Lord, through the affections of spiritual truth and good; which affections are implanted by the Lord in a wonderful way, in the truths of the former rational; and those things in it which are in agreement, are thus vivified, but the rest are separated from it, as of no use. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 2657.)

For example: when this new light flows in from above, then the thief begins to realize that the pleasure of stealing, and "getting away with it," which was so attractive before, is not to be compared with the pleasure of honesty. A couple entered a restaurant in a big city, and proceeded to "hold up" the place. At one of the tables sat an old woman. When the young outlaws had left, with the few dollars they had stolen, the old woman opened her heart to a reporter who came for the "story" of the robbery. "I wish I could talk to that poor girl just a few minutes," she said. "She doesn't know how foolish she is: I do, for I've lived it." The woman had

been one of the most notorious female crooks and desperadoes of her day. And there she sat, old and wrinkled and bent with age, a "worker" in one of the city missions. She had tried dishonesty and honesty, crime and uprightness, and had learned that crime is "all wrong." The light from above had broken through the veil and had entered the lower plane, and set things there in order. The glamor and excitement of wrong-doing had been torn aside, and evil had been seen in all its ugliness. The false standards of life, insinuated into the mind from the hells, had been unmasked, and their true nature revealed, because the light from above had shone into the rational.

> The Rational is the medium which unites the external with the internal, and thus gives an apperception from the Lord *of what is going on in the external,* and thus reduces the external to obedience, and elevates it, and causes a man to be a man, so that he looks up to heaven. (Ibid., n. 1944. Again, the italics are mine.)

That is the purpose of this wonderful development, that light and power shall descend from the highest planes, down through it, as a medium, into the natural, to restore order there, and cause the things of the lower to serve the higher. "Nothing can make man blessed and happy," we are told "except that his natural conform to his rational, and both be conjoined. This is done solely through charity."

This whole wonderful development is perfectly and graphically pictured in the story of Ishmael and Isaac. Only a few words, touching up the main points. Abraham pictures to us the Internal—the celestial, or love principle. He greatly desires a "son"; this stands for the Rational Faculty. But in order for there to be a "son," there must be a "mother." The True Rational must have for its "mother," as we saw, the affection for genuine truth; not merely the affection for knowing—no, the affection for genuine truth, and the desire to be conjoined with it in the life. That affection is Sarai.

But Sarai is childless. That is another way of saying that we are not yet ready to look at truth from the standpoint of good. We are interested in learning things, and reasoning

about them, in a very natural way. This kind of reasoning is the Ishmael of the story, born of Hagar.

Notice! Hagar was a "bondwoman." She was the servant of Sarai. And notice well the words of Sarai, when she consents that Abraham shall have a child by Hagar: "It may be that I shall be built up by her." This first love of learning,—of getting together knowledge, is the "servant" of the higher affection for genuine truth. And this higher, later affection is "built up" by the first, and lower.

So Hagar, the Egyptian bondwoman, must have a son first. He is the "wild-ass man" of the natural: the love of argument; overbearing and conceited; contemptuous of all who differ from him; not interested in knowledge for the sake of use, but merely for the sake of knowing; and, above all, lacking in love, the mark of the spiritual.

But, later, we reach the stage when we realize that to be victor in an argument is *not* of first importance. First place must be given to the love of the good; that sober, quiet, judgment, which keeps the mouth closed when what is even true may hurt; that more mature reasoning, which sees things from the standpoint of what is *good*. That will come; and when it does, then we shall call it "Isaac."

When it comes, Ishmael and Hagar must go. Isaac, not Ishmael, is the true "heir," or "son." The real nature of Ishmael is clearly shown in the fact that he "mocked" Isaac. As we said, the first rational has no use for things spiritual. All its conclusions about God and religion are drawn from the knowledges given by the senses and the letter of the Word. All possibility of there being a higher form of knowledge is treated as absurd. Ishmael "mocks" Isaac. Therefore he must be driven out, together with the affection for merely knowing.

Just a few final words about this True Rational. We should neither underestimate it nor place too much value upon it. It is the connecting link between the spiritual and the natural, as we saw; and without it we could never become spiritual

men and women. But, notice! Rationality does not necessarily imply spirituality.

It is one thing to be rational, and another to be spiritual. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 569.)

Every spiritual man is also rational; but a rational man is not always spiritual. Be it known that the rational does not introduce into the spiritual; the spiritual inflows into the natural by means of the rational.

I am minded of those who would "try" the doctrines of the Church, and even of the Word, with the test of reason and experience. Our power to reason is a wonderful, God-given faculty, but it has its limitations as far as spiritual things are concerned. And that is where revelation steps in, and supplies what the reason, unaided, cannot secure. In the "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 2538, we read these significant words:

In regard to doctrine the case is this: Insofar as there is what is human [that is, what is of sense, of memory-knowledge and of the rational] as the ground of belief, so far the doctrine is null and void. But insofar as doctrine is believed without these things, so far doctrine lives. For so far the Divine flows in. It is that which is proper to the human which hinders influx and reception. But it is one thing to believe from what is of the rational, of memory-knowledge and of sense [that is, to consult such things in order to believe], and quite another thing to confirm and corroborate by means of things rational, of memory-knowledge and of the senses, that which is believed.

What does this mean to me? It means, that the rational, no matter how far it may be developed, can never take the place of revelation from God, can never take the place of that simple, beautiful dependence upon Him for enlightenment and guidance, which are the mark and sign of the wisdom of the highest angels.

Wm. H. Beales.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"CONTRIBUTIONS OF SCIENCE TO RELIGION" *

The plan of the present volume is to consider the legitimacy of the religious life and world-view. In Part I [The World Given by Science] recognized authorities state briefly the chief elements of our knowledge in various fields of investigation. In Part II [Scientific Cooperation with Nature] other authorities describe typical experiments in furthering human welfare by proper adjustment of life to the impersonal forces of the universe; and in Part III [Religion, the Personal Adjustment to Environment] religion as an essentially similar adjustment of life (but through personal relations) with our environment is found to be warranted by our expanding knowledge of reality.

The above is the explanation of the purpose of this work. As author Dean Mathews contributes the Introduction and all of Part III; as editor he has evidently guided the composition of Parts I and II, made up of the following chapters:

Part I. The Scientific Method of Reaching Truth, by William E. Ritter; The Structure of Matter, by Robert A. Millikan; The Structure of the Cosmos, by Edwin B. Frost; The Making of our Earth, by Edward B. Mathews; The Nature of Life, by C. Judson Herrick; Plant Life, by John M. Coulter; Animal Evolution, by Horatio Hackett Newman; Social Evolution, by Ellsworth Faris; Mind and Evolution, by Charles H. Judd.

Part II. Recent Contributions of Medicine to Human Welfare, by John M. Dodson; Eugenics, by Charles B. Davenport; What Science Has Done for Agriculture, by E. Davenport; Sanitation, by C-E. A. Winslow.

These writers are, for the most part, recognized masters in their lines, and their contributions are competent popular presentations of the several subjects,—as popular, that is, as

* *Contributions of Science to Religion.* By Shailer Mathews and others. N. Y.: D. Appleton & Co. 434 pp., 8vo., illus. Cloth, $3.00.

could be expected in a production intended to be such merely in a limited sense. It may be said of more than half, that, independently of the particular purposes of the work under consideration, they are excellent introductions to the subjects treated, and may be read with profit, whether the main intention of the work is effective or otherwise. Incisive criticisms of all of them would require an equal corps of specialists, as the task is beyond the capacity of one critic. Taking those chapters, however, on which the reviewer is able to express something more than amateur opinion, it may be said that the ones on Animal Evolution, Social Evolution, and Mind and Evolution are of superior order.

Turning to the morals which Dean Mathews endeavors to draw, on behalf of religion, from his several scientific texts, I conclude that, though what he says is for the most part distinctly good, as in the emphasis which he places on the personal relation which must exist between man and the universe, he is at the same time too apologetic and insufficiently definite. In the first place he admits that religion has been the bad boy who has acted scandalously and most unreasonably toward his younger brother science, and deserves the beating which the latter is now able to give him; but he promises not to do so any more, and as an earnest of his good intent agrees to play "follow my leader" hereafter, or, in other words, to use scientific methods. Thus religion is discussed "according as its expression has been conditioned by its environment"; vestiges of earlier religious forms, concepts and institutions are to be studied; and lastly "the struggle for the survival of the socially fittest among religions." In other words, here we have an evolution of religion modeled on the evolution of everything else, an evolution very capably treated, too, and set forth in an interesting manner, but with serious limitations.

While systematic religion should not hesitate to admit its past sins, and repent of them, it has grounds for protesting that it is not entirely responsible for all those laid to its charge. It might claim that the learned men who committed them were the scientists of their time as well as its theologians, the two

classes not having become separated, and that therefore the guilt should in some measure be shared between them. It might call attention to the fact that the doctrine of a flat earth was a scientific theory which had the greatest probability in its favor when it was in favor; and that the same was true of the theory of a motionless earth about which the sun revolved, and of the theory of a solid vault and a sky-land above and of an inhabited subterranean realm below, as well as of many another discarded hypothesis. Theologians with minds especially attuned to natural phenomena, the forerunners of the later scientists, would naturally be the first to detect the falsity of such beliefs, and hence the seeming "contest between science and religion"; but much of the work of reformation was done by men connected with the church, and the errors which they set right were largely errors in scientific fact, not errors in religious principle. The church was at fault in thinking that from a knowledge of certain spiritual truths it could determine how those truths would be expressed in the material world. Thus it set itself against the acts of God by imagining it knew how God must act; and it persecuted those who set forth God's truths, under the delusion that it was defending those truths. Its sins were great; but it may claim with some reason that they were not entirely its own, since the spiritual ancestors of both theologians and scientists together formerly held, and upheld, the now discredited hypotheses.

And secondly, Dean Mathews's scientific religion proves to be most unscientifically vague. In attempting to characterize the nature of religion, he says:

> (1) It treats certain elements of its environment personally (though not necessarily as a person), by utilizing social practices and ideas as forms of worship, or as patterns for beliefs; and (2) it seeks to make these elements friendly, and so helpful.

This is well so far as it goes, but the emphasis on the personal element is too slight. From my own experience of primitive religions I should say that without a personal element there is no religion, and the idea of personality is never far removed when a real religious instinct is astir. Thus Mathews

is, I believe, in error when he attempts to postulate as a first stage in the evolution of religion one in which men dealt directly with natural forces. In every object of religious concern there is, indeed, a non-human element, but there is also a human element. A hill, a tree, a rock, the sky, a plant, an animal, is not worshipped as a natural object pure and simple, but it is worshipped—or approached with emotion—as containing a fragment of human psychology; and without that human element it is not venerated at all. It is therefore distinctly misleading to say that "the primitive gods in the earliest strata of survivals and literature in which we can trace religious concepts are natural forces." On the contrary, they are personalities associated with natural forces.

Mathews is also in error when he states that "the worship of dead ancestors . . . is to be found all but universally in simple civilizations." In fact, it is found in some simple and in some advanced civilizations (like that of China), and is wanting in many simple and many advanced civilizations.

Again, although there is undoubtedly a certain correlation between the social or political condition of a tribe and the character of its deities, we cannot argue too certainly from one to the other. In Australia we find belief in a supreme deity in the southeastern part of the country and a mixture of polytheism and ancestor worship, with magic highly developed, in the center and north. Monarchy in its imperial form reached a higher development in the Roman Empire than in Israel; but in no case did the power attributed to its gods approach that conceded to Jehovah. The monotheistic idea was introduced to the world, not by a successful conquering state, but by a band of exiles from a disrupted political organism, and one which, except for a very brief period, did not rank among the leading monarchies of its time.

Our author argues that local gods became national at one stage of evolution, and that, at another, a national religion passed on into monotheism. But neither proposition can be made into a general formula. In many cases the supreme deity is associated with the sun or sky, and is not local to any group

of an embryonic nationality; indeed, there is reason to think that some sort of heaven god, or at least some deity of a general character became national without ever having constituted part of a local cult. The passage to monotheism is not inevitable, nor, as has just been pointed out, is it connected peculiarly with monarchical absolutism. It was probably latent from very early times in the conception of a supreme heaven god; and there is no reason based on the facts of anthropology to deny that monotheism may have been the religion of the oldest peoples, if we remember that we are not to think of it as the cult of one god to the exclusion of others but the sense of personality at the base of the universe. This sense of personality in time may have split up into the conception of personalities, and have given birth to all the various types of religious phenomena with which we are familiar.

Since Mathews's evolutionary series begins with a direct attitude toward nature devoid of personal connotations, he is enabled to consider later beliefs as constituting in some sense a decline, and prophesy a future ascent to a world religion which "cannot believe in an anthropopathic God, but on the other (hand) is not ready to deny personality in terms of purpose and reason to the great process in which mankind finds itself involved." But in purpose and reason there is either the personality of the believers, or the personality of something higher, i.e., God; and we cannot accept human personality, and deny Divine personality. We know of no purpose and reason apart from personality.

In his chapter on "Scientific Method and Religion" Mathews makes a strong and sure point in opposition to authority in religion; but when he undertakes to adopt the empirical method of understanding religion, he has no theoretical or doctrinal principles to guide him, and is driven to assert that religion "is not a philosophy, but a mode of vital action." Now it is perfectly true that religion is never real until it is lived, and it is also true that the practice of religion must ever be expanding; but why is theory unnecessary? In each of the sciences,

after which Dean Mathews would model religion, there is a theory and a practice, a system of truth and the same applied. But now we are told that, although modeled on science, religion differs in being merely applied; it has no philosophy, i.e., no theoretical aspect. In very fact Mathews feels that some sort of theoretical accompaniment is necessary, and this he finds, as we have seen, in the recognition of personality in the universe, in other words in the recognition of God. "God in himself can never be known, since all knowledge must be of the phenomenal, but His existence must be assumed as necessary to our moral life." And our author devotes a chapter to proving that the several sciences indicate personality to exist behind the phenomena of nature, and another to establishing the contention that "science gives content to religious thought"; but beyond the mere fact that science has shown an orderliness in nature altogether conformable to the religious conception of a Divine government he does not go. In other words, the representative of religion in this symposium which he has inspired, is able to contribute to it only the fact that natural law and order and human experience indicate the existence of a Deity.

The acknowledgment of a Deity is, of course, vital to any religion. But is the recognition of this bare fact all that our modern scientific cult can yield? Would a physicist feel that he had given a sufficiently satisfactory sketch of his subject by mere acceptance of the law of gravitation? Or a chemist if he simply asserted the law that elements combine in definite proportions? Or a biologist if he were only to affirm that all life is associated with a substance called protoplasm? Mathews has gone no further, nay not as far, as the literal affirmation in Scripture that "God made man in his own image," and that "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork."

A New-Churchman should, however, be able to diagnose this situation without any hesitation. It means, as Swedenborg would put it, that the first Christian Church, the Christian Church as custodian of a definite body of doctrine, is completely vastated; nothing remains of it in the light of the new

scientific day except a bare recognition of Deity, and a still vaguer sense of personality attaching to Him. And this vague conception is hitched to the world now revealed by science in an equally vague manner. Nor is the reason far to seek. Dean Mathews's Deity is the Deity of orthodox Christianity after all, without forms, parts, or passions—including, as a contradiction it is true, the equally orthodox conception of a trinity with the self-contradictions of that concept little if at all alleviated (p. 405). Does he not see that, if there is a trinity, and if man was made in God's image, and if the heavens and the firmament do in any essential way declare His glory and show forth His handiwork, that trinity must appear in them also? Does he not see also that God cannot be infinite uniformity but must be infinitely organized, and that organization must be reflected in whole and in detail in all of His creation? The Dean's Deity affects one as an entity which he is trying desperately hard to hitch to a universe which can get along very well without Him; whereas, if there be a God indeed, He must be inscribed on every atom of His creation; He must in fact be the one significant factor therein.

But we must not be too critical. Very likely our author feels this very thing, but knows not how to prove his case. He has no principles by means of which he can suggest the meaning of natural phenomena translated into Divine terminology. The revelation of such principles was Swedenborg's great contribution to humanity: the principles of the Grand Man, Degrees, Correspondences, and the Internal Senses by virtue of which nature has a Divine meaning and the Bible is a Divine book. It need not be claimed that we are possessed of an inerrant, fixed method of translation by means of which everything in nature can instantly be explained. What we do have is an introductory manual leading to a truly scientific religon, but one that will expand before the investigator *pari passu* with his own progress and his moral preparedness. For Dean Mathews is quite right in placing emphasis on religion as "a mode of vital action". We merely wish to insist with equal firmness that true religion must also have its intellectual side, its philosophical content. JOHN R. SWANTON, PH.D.

THREE BOOKS WORTH READING:

The Massachusetts New-Church Union has recently acquired the entire publisher's remainder of the following books by that ardent Swedenborgian, Henry James, the elder, father of the late Professor William James, the psychologist, and Henry James, the novelist.

One of his New-Church reviewers remarked: "There is nothing of the commonplace in what Mr. James gives to the world. . . No one can carefully read his works without great gain."

The third work listed below contains a long Introduction (119 pages) by the late Professor James, in which he attempts to give a faithful portrait of his father as a religious prophet and genius: "for he was a religious prophet and genius, if ever prophet and genius there were" (p. 12).

"The Secret of Swedenborg; Being an Elucidation, of His Doctrine of the Divine Natural Humanity," by Henry James. 258 pp., 8vo. (Former price, $3.00) **Price $2.00**

"Society the Redeemed Form of Man, and the Earnest of God's Omnipotence in Human Nature," by Henry James. 496 pp., 8vo. (Former price, $2.50) **Price, $2.00**

"The Literary Remains of the Late Henry James; Edited with an Introduction by William James." 471 pp., 8vo. **Price, $2.50**

Order of the

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 Bowdoin Street, - - - Boston 9, Mass.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT

¶ A cheap, well illustrated and concise life of Emanuel Swedenborg.
¶ Suitable for the use of all the Societies and Missionary Institutions of the Church.

The MISSIONARY AND TRACT SOCIETY of London begs to announce the republication of the

"LIFE OF SWEDENBORG"

By the late J. Stuart Bogg. Revised by Rev. H. G. Drummond.
5 x 7½ inches; 40 pages and paper cover; 15 illustrations.
Price Threepence, postage extra, (say 10c. postpaid).
Order of NEW-CHURCH PRESS, Ltd.,
1, Bloomsbury Street, London, W. C. 1, England

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the
Massachusetts New-Church Union
134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
LIBRARY EDITION, $1.50 per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid. The titles in this edition are: "Heaven and Hell," "Divine Love and Wisdom," "Divine Providence," and "The Four Doctrines."

THE AMERICAN SWEDENBORG PRINTING AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY

16 East 41st Street New York, N. Y.